DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 289 HE 011 923

AUTHOR Bess, James L., Ed.
TITLE Academic Work: Doing It Well: Doing It Better.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 158p.: Papers presented at a conference held at Teachers College, Columbia University (New York, NY, April 14-15, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty: Conference Reports: Faculty College Relationship: *Faculty Development: *Faculty Evaluation: Higher Education: Historical Reviews: Learning Theories: Organizational Development: *Teacher Improvement: Trend Analysis
IDENTIFIERS *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

Papers presented at a conference sponsored by Teachers College, Columbia University and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education are provided. "The Profession--Critical Themes for Development," by James Bess discusses concerns of the profession viewed from a broad philosophic and sociological point of view. "Faculty Development and Evaluation--Whence, Whither, and How," by Al Smith presents a retrospective view of the nature of the field of faculty development, tracing its history and giving some general directions. "Who Needs Faculty Development--And Why," by Richard Miller examines what kinds of faculty development are needed, by whom, and why. "Faculty Development and Organizational Development," by Ronald Boyer traces the connections between organizational development and faculty development. In "Developmental Theories of Learning" Roger Myers explores the way students learn. Gary Quehl's "The Developmental Stages of the Faculty Improvement Field" and the "Success and Failures in Recent Faculty Development Efforts," by David Justice consider the future of faculty development. A preface and concluding remarks by the editor are provided as well as author biographies. (Author/PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180289

ACADEMIC WORK
Doing It Well: Doing It Better

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James L. Bess

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

James L. Bess
Editor

Papers from a conference held at Teachers College, Columbia University, April 14-15, 1978

HE 011 923

CONTENTS

		Page
	Preface -- James L. Bess	1
Chapter I	The Profession: Critical Themes for Development -- James L. Bess	5
Chapter II	Faculty Development and Evaluation: Whence, Whither and How -- Al Smith	17
Chapter III	Who Needs Faculty Development--And Why -- Richard I. Miller	53
Chapter IV	Faculty Development and Organizational Development -- Ronald K. Boyer	65
Chapter V.	Developmental Theories of Learning -- Roger Myers	97
Chapter VI	The Developmental Stages of the Faculty Improvement Field -- Gary H. Quehl	107
Chapter VII	Success and Failures in Recent Faculty Development Efforts -- David Justice	120
Chapter VIII	Concluding Remarks -- James L. Bess	141
	References	143
	Author Biographies	146
	Index	147

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to many persons for their contributions and assistance in the planning and execution of the conference at which these papers were presented. The conference consisted of a day and a half of paper presentations, workshops and informal discussions and colloquies. In this volume, only the formal papers are reprinted, but we would be very much remiss were we not to recognize the most important work of the workshop leaders, not only in the scheduled sessions, but in the "behind-the-scenes" activity as they worked intimately with many of the conference participants on special problems at individual campuses. Our workshop leaders included Lance Buhl, John Centra, Peter Seldin and Bill Toombs, and their help is acknowledged with much thanks.

The conference was co-sponsored by Teachers College and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education in Washington, D.C. We wish to give special thanks to the Clearinghouse and to Jonathan Fife, its Director, in particular for taking on the burden and responsibility for mailing the brochure. Jon was also an invaluable aid in offering advice and hints about making this kind of a conference successful, his experience with other conferences sponsored by ERIC providing much useful guidance.

The Riverside Church, at which part of the conference was held, was efficient, exemplary in service, and wonderfully bending and unbureaucratic in responding to our many last-minute changes. Our thanks to Mrs. Francis Lachman for her excellent work. Finally, Dr. Amy Rose, then a graduate assistant in the Center for Adult Education at Teachers College, planned, coordinated and managed with dispatch and a calm competence the many details which make a conference go smoothly and gracefully. She deserves our special thanks.

J.L.B.

Preface

James L. Bess

Some time ago Harold Wilensky questioned whether all occupations would eventually become professionalized, concluding that they would not. His prediction is proving true. Though there is a continual strain in society for occupations to strive for the benefits of professional designation and status, many kinds of work do not seem to require professional preparation, standards and controls. Indeed, society is now beginning seriously to question the freedom and license (sic) which it had traditionally ceded to professions in the past. The myth and mystery accorded by society to the professional, were established and protected by years of schooling by and for a selected elite. They were often maintained through the exercise by practitioners of a dogmatic and supercilious attitude and authority which dissuaded the client from questioning either the quality of the services rendered or the motives of the practitioner. Credos of each profession were articulated to the public by a largely unregulated professional corps who were able to ignore or fend off the scattered and powerless queries of a few of the disenchanted.

With the beginning of the twentieth century, important changes took place in some professions. The shock to the medical profession of the Flexner report, for example, resulted in some substantive and critical rethinking of curriculum and organization in the medical education. In social work, Werner Boehm's study for the Council on Social Work Education (1959) had enormous impact, while in nursing, the Goldmark (1923) and the Lysaught (1970) reports were of considerable significance in changing that field. Until recently, however, higher

education has managed somehow to remain somewhat more impervious to external criticisms. In the past, the Jacob report, the Truman Commission and the Newman reports may have upset some. And, the generally strident and emotional student movements of the sixties spurred a number of recessary reforms (many since revoked). More recently, Caroline Bird's lonesome voice of criticism has struck at academic hypocrisies. But, the public in our domain was not listening or could not respond effectively. The profession has its perennial and powerful defenders. For example, the Carnegie Commission and Council have been only moderately critical of the success of colleges and universities, while on the research front, Msrs. Hyman, Wright, and Reed in their book have gone to great lengths to demonstrate (often convincingly) the effectiveness of undergraduate education. Quite naturally, we prefer to listen to such positive stroking than to others who are more critical.

It is not surprising that the lay public could not mobilize its forces of criticism of the academic profession. The latter is, after all, nothing if not adept at rationality and organized thought, while the former consists of occasional concerned and angry parents with a temporary and largely uninformed skepticism about what effect higher education is having on their offspring. In addition, the inbreeding (some say "incestuousness") of the federal government-academic world connections generally protects the profession from threatening inquiry from Washington sources.

All this is surely not to argue for more interference by either the public or the government. It is only to note the sociological facts of the history of the academic profession. It is ironic that the forces finally calling to question the inadequacies of the academic

profession are best explained in terms of the sociology of demographic figures--we simply will not have enough students to teach, and with the excrescences of the profession's profligacy, we have been hoist on own petard, overspending our credibility and using up our "idiosyncrasy credits" with the people who are paying the bills.

In short, those of us who have always been concerned with good education and good teaching are now finding ourselves with an ear in the central administrations of our colleges and universities. For a variety of reasons, at least for the present, "faculty development" is at least something to which college and university authorities are willing to give vocal support. At best, it is something to which they may find it both expedient and propitious to offer meaningful financial backing and to organize administrative and faculty efforts in a more concerted manner.

Given the extraordinary economic pressures facing the profession as well as our moral obligation both to our constituencies and ourselves to improve the delivery of services, it has seemed useful to some of us at Teachers College to take stock at this time of our current academic policies and to begin the processes of mapping out a plan for developing and improving practice. In the papers which follow, we begin with a broad thematic perspective. In my introduction, I lay out the important concerns of the profession viewed from a broad philosophic and sociological perspective. Al Smith's paper gives us a retrospective view of the nature of the field of faculty development, tracing its history, scope, and general directions. In Ron Boyer's paper, we are introduced to the intimate connections between organizational development and

faculty development--neither being possible without the other. As Boyer broaches the nomothetic dimension, so Dick Miller attacks the problem from the idiographic--what kinds of faculty development for whom and why.

We shift ground somewhat with the next papers. Roger Myers brings us usefully to the crux of the question of the improvement of teaching--namely, the ways students learn (in Myers' terms, the way they grow and develop). If we are to have any true impact, he argues, surely we must give attention to the dynamics of the learning processes both in the affective and cognitive domains. The final two papers deal with the future of faculty development. Gary Quehl's imaginative paradigmatic approach to the field as a whole contrasts most constructively with the pragmatic emphases of David Justice's discussion of recent successes among the projects supported by the Fund for the Improvement of Post-secondary Education.

We have tried at the conference and in these papers to offer some sense of the present and future of academic work and of the requirements for its professionals. We present in this volume the current practices set in a theoretical framework, bridging the two whenever possible. We were concerned not with giving the participant at the conference and the reader a picture of practice--so that on his/her own campus he/she could follow a "paint-by-numbers" approach. Rather, we wanted to present a variety of practical approaches but organized around themes and paradigms, theories and concepts. Such an organization of the subject would, we hoped, allow a more intelligent planning on individual campuses, tailored to separate institutional objectives, values and personnel. We trust our intention and its execution will be of service.

Chapter I

The Profession: Critical Themes for Development

James L. Bess

The academic profession is in critical need of redefinition and rededication. The processes of exploring the possibilities for such reordering of efforts and aims will necessitate a deep and penetrating probing into the underlying forces which drive any social system. In this chapter, we stake out those often countervailing forces which would seem to undergird the analysis of the academic profession and its requirements for upgrading and development. There are at least ten salient and interpenetrating themes around which faculty development efforts are centered. Recurring frequently in the papers in this volume, they are the following:

- The relationship between knowing and doing and the problem of efficient utilization of codified knowledge
- Organizational learning -- growth and change in human personality (students, faculty, administrators) and in organizational systems
- The division of labor -- the optimum balance of generalist and specialist in the effective teacher and the effective organization
- Adaptation to external demands -- developing constructive relationships with outside agencies
- Building supportive climates for evaluation and change
- Recruitment of the teacher of the future -- the reestablishment of the professional service motif
- Performance evaluation
- Adult growth and development -- identifying the apparent staging and sequencing of changes in adult orientations
- The relationship between intrinsic satisfaction from work and the motivation to work
- The relationship between organizational and personal goal achievement

Let us discuss each of these in some detail.

Two of the themes appear to deal with the ways in which we conceive of and "manage" knowledge in today's society and more particularly in a college or university community. The first concerns the relationship between knowing and doing--the classic dualism, addressed by many philosophers, but perhaps most trenchently by John Dewey. In the context of higher education, we are faced increasingly with the problem of how to utilize the body of codified knowledge which has been accumulated in each of the disciplines. Whereas in the last century, the discovery of knowledge was energized by pragmatic needs, today the research directed at "knowledge for its own sake" has increased dramatically. This is in part a function of the reward system for faculty which encourages research and publication, regardless of its actual or potential utility. But in part it is a legitimate problem of the fantastic growth and fragmentation of knowledge. We could at one time frequently ask the question of "what knowledge is most worth having"--and we felt confident that there might be an answer. Today, to overstate the case, we are not so certain. We know neither what to teach, what to research, or to what ends our reservoirs of codified knowledge can best be put in service to society.

Such ambiguity creates enormous problems in the education and training of professionals. While in the past professionals in many fields gained much of their expertise through clinical experience via apprenticeships to skilled practitioners, we now believe that by far the major part of professional education comes through the mastery of a body of knowledge learned in graduate school. (Admittedly, in certain professions more than others, some clinical training and apprenticeship occur in graduate school.) By and large we assume in our own profession

that faculty in higher education are professionals by virtue of their concentrated periods of study on a university campus. We rarely give our graduate students any background or skills in understanding how to interpret and organize the bodies of knowledge they have mastered in ways which permit them to transmit it meaningfully or apply it usefully. Typically, the new Ph.D. or faculty member will know in classical terms how the knowledge in his/her area is arranged--schools of thought, major writers, research tools, etc. These are hardly sufficient to permit faculty to make intelligent use of their knowledge in pursuits which are required of them as professionals. In short, a central theme in faculty development efforts in the next several decades will be the

recasting of knowledge into new taxonomies which meet the variety of needs of the field of practice. The aim will be an attenuation of the separation between knowing and doing.

The second knowledge-related theme which will be increasingly important in faculty development is related to the above. We need to know far more about how organizations learn. By organizations, I mean personality organization as in students, faculty and administrators; formal organizations like colleges and universities; and the public at large. Clearly, the knowledge we presently have of student growth and development, while still relatively uncharted compared to some other, older fields, is in some ways quite sophisticated, as Roger Myers demonstrates in his paper. Unfortunately, we have made practically no effort to integrate such knowledge in our instructional development efforts. But besides our clients, we also learn and grow as teachers and administrators. In this domain, we know practically nothing, though it is clearly critical to our understanding of the modes by which we must improve our professional performance.

Behavioral scientists are also mapping out the patterns of organizational learning--showing us how organizations adapt to changes in their environments, how the social dynamics of organizations shift with movements among their personnel. If we are to organize our faculty development efforts in rational ways, we must know more about these organizational processes and how they affect faculty motivation and productivity.

Indeed, the question of organization underlies several other themes which must be considered in faculty development. Take the issue

of specialists versus generalists, for example. With the expansion of knowledge and partly in response to economic incentives in society most professions have seen the efforts of their practitioners increasingly functionally differentiated. Clients in the public find it necessary to seek out persons who have carved out ever smaller domains of expertise. Thus far in higher education, we have resisted such specialization, except in the research area. Of course, we have more and more sub-fields of knowledge. But the faculty member in higher education is still required to be a multifunctioned professional. He/she must teach, do research, perform administrative and public service. In another publication (Bess, 1977), I describe some 320 separate tasks in which faculty in universities engage, most of which might be considered a sub-profession of its own.

The question is how much specialization is functional both for the institution and for the individual--functional in terms of efficient delivery of services and of effective use of human talent? For example, is there a single profession of "teaching"? Or are there sub-professions within the teaching profession? Is there, for example, a profession of advising--or is that too specialized? Moreover, if we are to move in the direction of increasing specialization of function among faculty, on what grounds will the new professional domains be organized, and how will they be integrated with one another? The answers to such questions are crucial to the organization of faculty development efforts, for if we are to educate and train new kinds of professionals, then we must understand the nature of the professions which are likely in the future.

Organizations, of course, do not exist separate from the social and economic systems of which they are a part and to which they are functionally related. Colleges and universities are parts of regional and state systems (however loosely may be the formal ties), and they are accountable to those external systems. So also, faculty are responsive to their professional organizations and peer or reference groups (more or less depending on the particular type of faculty and institution). Faculty development must be set in this context. For to improve faculty efforts we must be very much aware of and must take account of the environmental constraints under which faculty operate. Organizations and persons external to the institution can be supportive, repressive, or indifferent, and we need to understand the dynamics of that interaction in order better to plan our faculty development and evaluation programs.

Still another organizational theme is the matter of creating a "climate" which is supportive of the changes we are anxious to induce. Charles Neff at the State University of New York has illustrated the problem by referring to the "tuning and pruning" conflict. By the tuning process, he means the tactic of administrators who say, "All right, faculty, trust us; we're going to work with you on your own development." The pruning process, on the other hand, is the response of administrators to financial exigencies. Here they are likely to lop off programs and faculty, often without due participation by faculty. Clearly, the messages to faculty of tuning and pruning are conflicting. The creation of a consistent, persistent and convincing organizational climate is one of the major ongoing concerns of effective institutional

leadership. Typical climates in colleges and universities are rife with suspicion, intrigue, doubts of integrity, and the absence of either perceived or de facto community. It is little wonder that administrative statements about the "payoff" for faculty who demonstrate improved performance by virtue of faculty development efforts are viewed with some skepticism by faculty.

Two other very important themes having to do with the nature of the profession should figure importantly in faculty development efforts. The first is the reinstitutionalization of the service motif as an essential characteristic of academic professionals. Graduate students attracted to the profession presently are likely to be dominated by the cognitive/rational sides of their personalities (Bess, 1978). Proclivities toward "feeling" and "caring" are not among the dispositions in graduate school applicants which are typically sought out by faculty reviewing student dockets for "good" students (and incipient successful faculty). As a result, many of the "helping" inclinations which good teachers are alleged to have are largely missing in graduate student applicant pools and in today's faculty. Since professionals are by definition assumed to embody a "service" orientation, it would appear that the academic profession may be running a risk of losing one of the justifications for its being. Indeed, there is some doubt that those faculty who are primarily interested in research have ever been sufficiently motivated by service ideals. The point is that if faculty development efforts are to succeed, we must have a clear notion of what professionalism is, and we must look to our recruiting policies as a constructive force in faculty development.

A related professional theme is evaluation. How we respond to demands for evidence of productivity among our professionals can determine the fate of higher education for the next half century. If we move, for example, toward a management by objectives or/and performance contracting system, we may violate some of the most cherished professional prerogatives of academia--the freedom and autonomy of the individual person to schedule and budget his/her time according to the dictates of conscience and commitment, without concern for the need to justify the allocation of time and effort. Yet, there is some discussion in the industrial psychology literature today which would seem to suggest that persons who are denied meaningful feelings of achievement (via the setting of real objectives) are deprived of the opportunity to derive significant satisfactions from their work. Establishing objectives in clear and unambiguous terms can be extremely threatening or the source of exhilaration and satisfaction depending most importantly on the climate of evaluation. In a setting which ritualistically and without exception rewards and punishes on the basis of achievement of prescribed objectives will be one which yields to the omnipresent organizational strain toward unremitting competition, lack of trust, lack of cooperation, rigidity and inflexibility. Contrast this with one which recognizes individual differences, emphasizes formative rather than summative evaluation, and believes in the necessity for fallibility when risks are high. Such an organization is likely to have a climate which encourages distinctive and unique contributions, is non-comparative in evaluations, and is normatively convinced of the worth of man and his desire to engage in productive activity for his

and society's sake. This kind of an organization will find faculty development an intrinsic part of its basic way of being.

Three final themes having to do with the nature of the professional and his/her career conclude this chapter. The first already has some salience in the research literature and is gradually receiving due recognition of its importance in a variety of practical affairs on college and university campuses. It is the theme of adult development and of the apparent staging and sequencing of the changes in adult orientations throughout the life cycle. We have begun to think about college students as adults and about adults as college students, but we still have a long way to go in comprehending the importance of theories of adult development in understanding the dynamics of faculty development. In two previous publications, I called attention to the potentials and possibilities for individual and institutional renewal through the identification of stages of faculty personal and career development. In the first (Bess, 1975), I suggested the utility of special organizational service units created to provide more organized public service and to provide "safe" transition periods and organizational bases for faculty to shift to other careers when desired. In the second (Bess, 1973), I noted that we need to recognize the intimate relationships between student and faculty life-cycle development and to integrate the two sets of social entities. Undergraduate and graduate students undergo stages of growth and development; so do faculty. There may be times during which there is an optimum integration or optimum kind of interaction of the two groups. There may be other times when it is absolutely not functional for either to have

contact with the other. Taking account of how this impacts our design of faculty development programs is important to the effectiveness of institutional teaching and research efforts.

Understanding the changing sources of motivation of faculty throughout the career cycle will be important. But we also need to be far more sophisticated in our analysis of the ways in which faculty seek and find their satisfactions in general. Again, in other publications (e.g., Bess, 1977), I have suggested that many faculty lose much of their beginning enthusiasm for teaching because they are unable to perceive "cues" in the teaching environment that they have been successful. While researchers have not yet determined definitively whether productivity leads to satisfaction, or satisfaction to productivity, it seems commonsensical to believe that faculty who are enabled to see themselves veridically as successful teachers will be more inclined to sustain their motivation to teach well and effectively. Lacking the knowledge and skills to find environmental stimuli which reinforce their demonstrated competences, faculty will soon seek other sources of satisfaction for which cues are more readily evident. In short, if we expect people to find intrinsic satisfaction from their work, we need to show them how to perceive when they are being successful. Furthermore, any organization in which workers are able to find satisfactions from the work itself will find ways of developing a formal reward system which supports those intrinsic satisfactions. External rewards, such as salary supplements or better office space, will hardly match the more meaningful pleasures offered by competently performed work. It makes far more organizational sense to generate a

formal reward system which is supportive of intrinsic satisfactions than one which tries to induce faculty into pursuits which are only moderately satisfying in and of themselves. Obviously, faculty development efforts can be of supreme importance here. For if they can demonstrate how faculty can find profound satisfactions in teaching, they can be instrumental in making the formal reward system truly supportive of it.

The last theme has to do with the integration of personality and organization (to use Harvard's Chris Argyris' apt encapsulation of the heart of the problems of modern complex organizations). The nature of the faculty career has changed radically, since David Riesman described his "pioneer settlers" and "pioneer adventurers" and since Caplow and McGee revealed the intrigues of the recruitment and hiring processes in colleges and universities. Reduced faculty mobility places an enormous burden on institutions to find ways of adapting their organizations to provide internal career mobility and/or to substitute different kinds of experiences for those which faculty were wont to seek out by moving to other campuses. An institution which ignores this problem will find its faculty increasingly disenchanted and unmotivated if not hostile. An enlightened institution, on the other hand, can use reduced mobility to create even greater commitment to it than existed in previous periods of ready faculty maneuverability across institutions. The problem, however, is not only one of organizational design--task and unit definition and redefinition. It is one of "institutionalization" of values, aims and culture. As Philip Selznick (1957) suggests, organizations must be "infused with value" if organizational members

are to be both strongly motivated to produce and constrained toward organizational ends. It is virtually impossible for faculty, however professional they may be, to comprehend deeply the meaning of their work and its implications for their organizations, their society and themselves unless values are clarified and made manifest in the institution in which they are working. Some contemporary pundits would say that goal ambiguity is not a "problem" of institutions of higher education. Rather it is a necessary characteristic of the nature of colleges and universities in a complex society with a human condition no longer determined by a tradition of stable ends or means. Such a perspective, however, seems unnecessarily escapist, avoiding the difficult if perplexing questions of leadership and organizational identity. Lower organisms in the course of evolution have been both stable and adaptive--identifying their objectives and making more efficient their means of achieving them while at the same time leaving to future generations ever stronger and more efficient organisms ready to meet the peculiar needs of their time. So also must colleges and universities (however more complex than lower organisms) through their resources of cognitive rationality recognize the real and present objectives of higher education and make as efficient a contribution to their own and society's well-being as possible. Future generations of colleges and universities can be left to adapt to their own circumstances. To abandon all goal definition and value clarification on the grounds that ambiguity is endemic to the institution is to leave to fate not only this generation's well-being but the security and success of its progeny.

Faculty development in its most pragmatic manifestations today may seem somewhat far removed from such broad and philosophical notions. Indeed, we must demonstrate its practical value immediately if it is to become an ongoing feature of colleges and universities. Yet, the context in which it is set is vital to its continuing success and to the success of the institutions of which it is a part. If it is conceived as a temporary stopgap measure intended primarily to meet exigencies of financial shortage and of faculty unhappiness, it will fail. If it is understood to be a central part of an institution's vitality, it must be set in the frame of a philosophical understanding of the nature of institutions, of the place of goals and values in those institutions, and of the critical importance of member identification with and embodiment of those goals and values.

Chapter II

Faculty Development and Evaluation: Whence, Whither, Why, and How

Al Smith

This chapter will be concerned with the following four questions: (1) "What have been the origins of faculty development and evaluation programs and the causes for our renewed interest in these two programs? (2) "Where are we going in these two areas?" (3) "Why are such programs necessary?" and (4) "How can these two functions best be performed?"

Faculty Development Defined

Before attempting to answer these questions, let us establish some definitions for the terms "faculty development" and "faculty evaluation." These definitions will then provide a framework for the rest of this chapter. In general, I feel very comfortable with Jerry Gaff's (1976) definition of "faculty development--i.e., Faculty development focuses on faculty members and seeks to promote their individual growth and development" (p. 8). Thus, faculty development is any program or activity in an institution of higher learning that has as its goal the enhancement of individual faculty skills and/or abilities, the clarification of values, and the development of increased motivation. Faculty development programs are those activities that help the faculty member perform more effectively his/her teaching, research or service responsibilities. Faculty evaluation on the other hand focuses on the appraisal of the faculty member's contributions to a particular academic or educational program in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Like faculty development programs, faculty evaluation activities should also help the faculty member to perform more effectively his/her

professional responsibilities at the highest level possible. Faculty evaluation programs, then, have as their major purpose faculty development, plus the provision of data for such personnel decisions as reappointment, merit salary, tenure, promotion, and workload assignment.

Based on these definitions, it can be said that faculty development and evaluation are really opposite sides of the same coin. They share the same major purpose--i.e., the development of human resources. A program in one area cannot be run effectively without the support of the other one. For these and other reasons (see below) I maintain that faculty development and evaluation should be viewed and administered as one program in American higher education. It is my contention that the separation of these two programs violates some of our best management principles, principles learned through years of research, and can only lead to continued failure and less than a full impact for both programs. I should also point out here that faculty development and evaluation are only a small piece of a much larger pie--the pie being staff development and evaluation. My own sense of the state of higher education today suggests that considerable attention needs to be given to current problems and issues in this broader area as well.

Origins of Faculty Development and Evaluation

But let us return to our first question, "What have been the origins of faculty development and evaluation programs and the causes for our renewed interest in these two programs?" Here we are really asking two questions. Let us first explore the origins of these programs.

Faculty development and evaluation programs have been a part of higher education for a long time. In our first universities, which date

back to the eleventh and twelfth centuries in Italy and Europe, faculty evaluation systems were in operation in primitive forms. The early systems did, however, provide a means for terminating a faculty member's employment when the faculty member failed to live up to student expectations in the classroom. Under this early system of education and evaluation all university profssors were required to wear long hooded robes. At the end of their lectures, they would turn their backs on their classes as the students filed out of the rooms. The students in turn would drop various sums of money into the faculty members' hoods to show their appreciation for the faculty members' efforts and help. This income in many cases was the professor's sole source of revenue. One can see why this became a very effective system for determining classroom teaching effectiveness. It was also a system under which the termination of a faculty member's service was a rather easy matter, requiring little, if any, administrator or colleague intervention.

Turning from student evaluation of faculty to administrator evaluation, we find that administrator evaluation is a much more recent development. In our early universities the faculty members performed most if not all of the administrative functions necessary to run their institutions. In fact some of our oldest universities maintained this tradition until very recently. Lord Eric Ashby, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University in England, for example, recently reported that when he was appointed vice-chancellor a few years ago he was not given an office or a secretarial staff to assist in the performance of his duties. While separate administrative structures in American colleges and universities have existed since the founding of Harvard College in 1636, it

was not until the turn of the nineteenth century that academic departments were formed. Hence, evaluations of faculty by department chairpersons is a relatively new development in faculty evaluation systems. Up until the advent of departmental units most administrator evaluations of faculty were conducted by college presidents and deans.

In terms of colleague and self-evaluations, we may assume that they too, originated in our earliest universities. It is difficult to imagine a system of higher education in the eleventh and twelfth centuries that did not have some form of colleague or peer review of a faculty member's performance. Similarly, it is hard to believe that faculty members in those early centers of higher learning did not take some time to reflect and report on their activities. Thus, we can see that the origin of faculty evaluation can be traced back to our earliest forms of higher education, the Italian university, except in the case of administrator evaluation of the faculty member's performance.

Let us now take a look at the origins of our faculty development programs. "Whence cometh faculty development?" One might answer "It cometh from the Lord!" and not be wrong, at least in the case of one very popular, traditional form of professional development--the sabbatical. The term "sabbatical year" originated in the time of Moses, approximately 1400 B.C. In Leviticus it is reported that the Lord instructed Moses and the Israelis to make every seventh year "a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord...." It might be supposed that this idea of taking a rest from one's duties every seventh year was picked up by faculty very early in the history of higher education.

As an aside it is worth noting that the Lord also instructed Moses

and the Jewish people at that time to refrain from work after 50 years, including seven sabbatical years. This special year of celebration and rest was to be called the "jubilee year." In the future we may want to experiment in our faculty development programs with the "jubilee year" idea. It could be a method for encouraging faculty to consider such options as early retirement, career changes, or future academic appointments under a declining salary situation. Under this approach all faculty might be given the opportunity to take a "jubilee year" with full salary at the age of 50 or 60. They would be encouraged to use this plan for (1) a career change into some other occupation, (2) early retirement one year later or (3) a declining salary situation if they chose not to leave the institution at the end of the year. This idea is attractive for a number of reasons of which space does not permit mention here. Such a program would probably not cost any more than some of our present faculty development efforts, however, and could be a real cost saver if a large number of faculty chose to participate.

Returning now to the origins of faculty development programs, we can safely say, in conclusion, that faculty development programs have been a part of higher education since the earliest universities. Most higher education faculty have for hundreds of years been involved in such traditional forms of professional development as independent reading, writing and research; travel; in-service workshops and seminars; conference participation; postdoctoral research and the taking of advanced degrees.

Causes of Renewed Interest in Faculty Development

Now that we have seen that faculty development and evaluation programs originated in the earliest forms of higher education, let us examine the second half of my first question which was "What have been the causes of our renewed interest in these two programs?" The factors that have caused this new interest are (1) declining financial resources or in other words the present financial crunch; (2) present and anticipated enrollment declines; (3) aging and ever increasingly tenured-in faculties; (4) increasing numbers of part-time faculty; (5) changing college missions; (6) public dissatisfaction with the quality of undergraduate education and the desire for increased accountability; and (7) the rapid expansion of collective bargaining agreements in recent years. Let us turn now to a description of why some of these factors are causing and will continue in most cases to cause pressure for improved faculty development and evaluation efforts over the next 10 or 12 years.

Declining financial resources in terms of real dollars and our continuing crunch (or crises as the case may be) have caused a renewed interest in these two areas for a number of reasons, some of which are more ethical than others. Because of declining resources college faculties and administrators have had to start thinking about ways to cut their budgets. Since faculty salaries often comprise between 50-75 percent of a college's general operative expenditures (higher education being highly labor intensive), major cost saving techniques have taken the form of either faculty cutbacks or frozen faculty budget line items (or both in many institutions). It has been these and other cost saving measures that have caused a renewed interest on the part of faculty

members and administrators in the quality of faculty development and evaluation programs. We can doubtless expect continuing interest in these areas through the 1980's.

Declining enrollments is another factor that has led to an ever increasing interest in these two areas. While we have only experienced one year, 1976-77, of actual enrollment declines among all colleges and universities within the United States, many institutions and departments or program areas have had rather severe declines. These declines have caused some groups of administrators and faculty to turn to faculty development and evaluation programs for possible answers to these enrollment problems. As enrollment declines develop in the years ahead, as they are sure to do, we can expect even more interest in faculty development and evaluation.*

Aging and the ever increasing numbers of tenured-in faculty members is the third factor causing renewed interest in these two topics. It is interesting to note that between the years of 1965 and 1975 the number of faculty employed in our postsecondary institutions has almost doubled. In 1965 the size of our higher education instructional staff was 340,000, by 1975 it had increased to 572,000, a gain of some 232,000 faculty. However it is projected to reach only 603,000 faculty in 1985, a net gain of only 31,000 faculty between 1975 and

---

*The reason why we can expect enrollment declines of a more severe nature in the 1980's is due to the fact that this is the last year that there will be increases in the number of graduating high school seniors. Starting next year we will experience declines in the size of our senior high school graduating classes that will persist well into the 1980's. By 1985-86 the graduating senior high school class is projected to be 2,681,000 students compared to 3,135,000 this year, a drop of some 454,000 students (Chronicle of Higher Education, September 19, 1977).

1985. (Chronicle of Higher Education, September 19, 1977). These statistics clearly show that we will continue to have an aging faculty over the next 15 to 25 years. Because of fewer new faculty hires in the next ten years we can also expect higher numbers of tenured faculty members. This will continue a trend that has been with us for sometime. Martin Trow (1977) reported recently that the proportion of college faculty members holding tenure in the United States had grown appreciably over the last six years, from 49 percent in 1969 to 57 percent in 1975; in universities, that proportion was up to about 60 percent from about 50 percent in 1969. This aging, tenured-in bulge of faculty members is one of the major reasons for the renewed interest in more effective faculty development and evaluation programs. This large group of professionals will need more and better opportunities for renewal, retraining and re-tooling in the 1980's if they are to keep up with ever changing knowledge bases in their fields, with the new research on college teaching and the teaching-learning process, and with changing student needs and interests, particularly in relationship to adult learners.

Ever increasing numbers of part-time faculty in our colleges and universities is causing a new interest in faculty development and evaluation practices for this group. In the last four years, the number of full-time faculty members in four-year colleges and universities grew by about 9 percent. In the same period, the number of part-time faculty members grew by 38 percent. At two-year institutions, an even more dramatic increase in part-time faculty is shown by figures from the National Center for Educational Statistics--up 80 percent in four years, while the number of full-time faculty members grew only 11 percent. If

this trend continues for the next five to ten years, as is likely, it will become increasingly important for institutions to provide improved faculty develoopment and evaluation programs for this new human resource (Magarell, 1978).

Other factors contributing to the renewed interest in faculty development and evaluation are changing college missions, general public dissatisfaction with the quality of undergraduate education, and the rapid expansion of collective bargaining. While space will not permit discussion of each of these factors, two examples may illustrate how collective bargaining has lead to increased interest in the two areas we are considering. The first relates to Florida where over the last two years, there has been an increasing interest on the part of the United Faculty of Florida in professional development benefits. This group, which represents some 5,000 faculty in the nine state universities, has been pushing very hard for an improved sabbatical program for faculty, a program that the universities did not have in any formal sense until the union came on the scene. I am sure that if we were to study collective bargaining agreements around the country over the last few years we would find a similar interest among other faculty groups in improved professional development packages. In the area of faculty evaluation recent research has shown that some faculty unions are attempting to negotiate the formal use of student ratings out of the faculty evaluation process. Thus, we see that collective bargaining agreements are impacting these two areas in a variety of ways.

The origins of faculty development and evaluation programs can be found in our oldest institutions. The new interest in these programs

can be traced to a variety of forces or factors that are operating on higher education today. But let us now turn to my second question "Where are we going in these two areas?"

Whither Faculty Development?

One of the best ways to answer this question is to examine the current literature and research on faculty development and evaluation programs. First in the area of faculty development there have been a number of publications produced over the last few years that describe the state of the art. Many of these same publications also point to the direction that faculty development programs are likely to take in the next few years. A number of these pieces are reviewed in an ERIC monograph (Smith, 1976). I would like to note here a few of the references that are described more fully in that monograph as well as some new ones that were not mentioned.

One of the first publications to describe where we should be going in the area of teaching improvement was the Group for Human Development's Change magazine publication, Faculty Development in a Time of Retrenchment published in 1974. This group recommended that colleges and universities should set up college or university-wide teaching improvement centers. They further recommended that college faculty members be encouraged to spend 10 percent of their time on professional improvement activities. The Group felt that unless faculty members were given additional support for their teaching through such centers and were encouraged to use more of their time for professional development, it was highly unlikely that instruction in higher education would be improved. This booklet created an awareness of the need for faculty development in the early 1970's and contained

many useful suggestions about starting points.

At about this same time Terry O'Banion (1973) in his book Teachers for Tomorrow argued that the task for the future was to improve the effectiveness of the existing faculty through in-service programs rather than to train new faculty through pre-service programs. This particular report focused on the need for staff development in community colleges. And like the Change publication, it heightened awareness about the need for faculty development in an increasingly important sector of higher education.

One year later Jerry Gaff identified the directors of approximately two hundred teaching improvement programs and studied in depth the operation of fifty-five of these programs. His book, Toward Faculty Renewal (1975) is one of the better descriptive research studies to date in the area of faculty development. He found that while most teaching improvement programs rest on a common set of assumptions and have the same general goals of improving instruction, many of them involve disparate types of enterprises. We will be indebted to him for some time for the three different approaches and conceptual schemes that he discovered in his research. These different approaches he called "faculty development," "instructional development," and "organizational development" (p. 9). Gaff's empirical research represents one of the first attempts to make some sense out of what was going on at that time in teaching improvement programs.

The most complete description of the state of the art however can be found in John Centra's research. In 1976 Centra surveyed 2,600 accredited degree-granting institutions in our country (two-year colleges,

four-year colleges, and universities) with 1,783 responding to his initial inquiry. Close to 60 percent (1,044) of these institutions said they had faculty development programs or sets of practices and identified the persons on campus who coordinated or were most knowledgeable about them. Each of the 1,044 identified college coordinators was sent a four-page questionnaire in the spring of 1976, and 756 or 72 percent of the group responded. Ninety-three doctoral-granting universities, 315 four-year colleges (B.A. or M.A. only), and 326 two-year colleges were in the final sample.

Centra's research provides the best description of faculty development practices in American higher education that we have today. By asking the participants in his study to describe the extent to which faculty at their institutions made use of 45 different development practices, Centra was able to identify, through factor analysis procedures, four groups of practices. These groups provide some clues about the kinds of development programs different types of institutions seem to enjoy. One group of practices was fairly traditional in that, with one exception, it included activities that had been part of faculty development for some time. Centra found these more traditional development efforts, such as sabbaticals and temporary teaching load reductions, were typical of some of the larger colleges and universities in the sample. Another set of related practices, high faculty involvement practices, found generally in some of the smaller colleges, consisted of those run by and for the faculty. Examples were the use of senior teachers or faculty with expertise to help other faculty. These smaller colleges were less able to afford specialists in instructional assistance, the third category of

practices identified. Here, several of the larger two-year colleges and universities in the sample apparently had enough resources and staff to support specialists in instructional services. The fourth and last group of practices emphasized assessment techniques (e.g., ratings by students, colleagues, administrators); these practices were found to be most common among the two-year colleges. (Centra, 1976, p. 63-64)

These four descriptions--traditional, high faculty involvement practices, instructional assistance, and assessment techniques--provide a somewhat different view of development programs than do the heuristic models discussed by Bergquist and Phillips (1975) and by Gaff (1975), though the "instructional assistance" category does overlap with their shared concept of instructional development. Bergquist and Phillips (1975) have depicted a faculty development program that included the following major components: instructional development, organizational development, and personal development. Their excellent model appears in the first of two handbooks, A Handbook For Faculty Development (1975).

Besides identifying four different types of faculty development programs in use today, Centra (1976) made some other findings that have implications on the "Why" and "How" of faculty development and evaluation (see below). He found that:

1. While sizable numbers of faculty members had been involved in development practices, teachers who wanted to get better were the group most involved, while those needing improvement were seen as the least involved. As a result of this finding he concluded that if development activities are to be deemed worthwhile, they should

be subscribed to by more faculty who need to improve. (p. 59)

2. Fewer than half the respondents said their institutions provided counseling or other personal development practices for faculty. (p. 61)
3. Growth contracting, while not widely used, was considered as having good potential as a faculty development practice. (p. 62)
4. One of the more effective practices found in this study was the providing of small grants to faculty for teaching improvements or innovations. (p. 62)
5. Over 40 percent of the institutions (two-thirds of the universities) had some kind of development unit. Some had decentralized offices. A few units included several specialists in such areas as instructional development, evaluation, technology, and media. The majority, however, had more modest staffs often only a director or coordinator. Found frequently at medium-sized two- and four-year colleges, most of these units had existed only two or three years and had not yet been evaluated adequately. In fact, fewer than a fifth of all institutions in Centra's study had completely evaluated their programs or activities.

Miller (1972) believes that any system of faculty evaluation in higher education should seriously consider beginning with the formulation of basic assumptions. The faculty evaluation model he recommends proceeds from the following six assumptions: (1) the trend toward

accountability will continue, (2) merit evaluation is preferable to a seniority system, (3) overall evaluation of faculty is inevitable, (4) every evaluation system can be improved, (5) professional development should be available to every faculty member who is evaluated, and (6) faculty evaluation should be for both advancement decisions and faculty development (pp. 4-12).

Miller then discusses operational principles that move his basic assumptions closer to realization. These principles become the guidelines for developing his faculty appraisal procedures. His four principles state that (1) "individualized evaluation" is best, (2) colleges should seek a variety of sources of input in evaluating faculty, (3) there must be effective management and utilization of evaluative data in every faculty evaluation system, and (4) there is no one best strategy for implementing faculty evaluation (pp. 4-20).

From these assumptions and principles, Miller develops a model for the evaluation of faculty that contains a broader conceptual view of the role of the college teacher than we have had in the past. Previously, we have conceptualized the teacher's role in terms of research, teaching, service, and professional activities. Miller points out that college teachers today are engaging in a much wider range of activities than in the past, and for this reason he feels that the following categories should be used in describing and evaluating college teaching: classroom teaching, advising, faculty service, and relations, management (administration, performing and visual arts, professional services, publications, public service and research (p. 21). Under Miller's system, the faculty member would enter into an annual performance contract with his or her department chairperson. Miller argues that such

a contracting process would lead to the establishment of tasks and the selection of evaluation criteria that would reflect: (1) the nature of the institution, (2) the needs and direction of the department, and (3) the interests and abilities of the faculty member (p. 80). Miller then describes a variety of procedures that could be used to collect data in each of his nine evaluation or performance categories. Finally, he shows how these data could be employed to calculate overall performance ratings for each faculty member under the system.

Miller's ideas are important because they seem to be supported by current research findings and subsequent recommendations for programs in this area. For example, recent research studies by the Southern Regional Education Board (1977) and by Boyd and Schietinger (1975), also of this regional group, have consistently recommended guidelines for evaluation programs that parallel Miller's (1972) suggestions. (Boyd and Schietinger examined faculty evaluation procedures in some 536 institutions in 14 Southeastern states. Their study looked at evaluation practices in community colleges, four-year colleges and universities.) Research by Peter Seldin (1975) also showed that private colleges were moving in the direction of Miller's comprehensive faculty evaluation plan. Seldin (1975) surveyed some 410 liberal arts college deans in 1973 to determine the nature of their evaluation practices. He found that private college deans rely on a wide-range of types and sources of information when they evaluate their faculties. Again, this finding is consistent with Miller's recommendations for data collection procedures. Seldin (1975) also found that the department chairperson was the central figure in an

institution's faculty evaluation and development program.

Because so much emphasis is often placed on student ratings of teachers in these newly emerging comprehensive systems, it is appropriate in closing to review in a general way what we know about such ratings. Anthony Grasha (1977), who has been working with Ron Boyer at the University of Cincinnati, has summarized the research on student ratings and college teaching methods as follows:

1. Ratings of teacher characteristics are not strongly related to the amount of content students learn.

2. Student inputs are reliable and valid within limits.

3. Most faculty and student demographic characteristics play a minimal role in influencing (student) ratings.

4. Teacher characteristics which are associated with effective teaching have been identified.

5. Instructional methods may be more effective than instructor characteristics in influencing the student's learning (pp. 19-28).

This summary suggests that student ratings have an important role to play in evaluation as well as in faculty development programs. However, these same findings indicate that student ratings should only be one of many sources of data for faculty development and evaluation. Certainly, the research findings on student ratings do not yet support the validity of this form of evaluation of faculty to the extent that it is used today by department chairpersons and most institutions.

Compared to the research on student ratings, very little research has been conducted on colleague or peer, administrator, and self-evaluations of college faculty members. Perhaps the best study to date in the area of colleague evaluations is the one by Centra (1977). In the study Centra found that inter-colleague ratings of a faculty

member's teaching performance lacked reliability. In contrast, Hildebrand and Wilson (1970) showed in their research that colleagues can provide very useful evaluations of their colleagues' non-classroom responsibilities. These two findings suggest that colleague evaluations should probably focus on aspects of the faculty member's job that do not require an assessment of his/her classroom performance--i.e., evaluations of course syllabi, tests, publications, committee work, etc. One study by Blackburn and Clark in 1971 found fairly high correlations between student, colleague, and administrator evaluations of college teachers. They also found negligible correlation between faculty members' self-evaluations and evaluations by administrators, colleagues, and students (Kulik, 1974, p. 3). This last finding suggests that while self-reports may be very beneficial to have as part of one's departmental evaluation system, they are likely to be biased and should be only one of many sources of information for both development and evaluation systems.

In response, then, to the question "Whither Faculty Development?", it can be said that the evidence supports the position that we are moving very rapidly into the formation of comprehensive models for both faculty development and evaluation. It can further be concluded that increasingly we are relying on evaluative data for both development and evaluation purposes from an ever-increasing number of sources--i.e., students, colleagues or peers, administrators, and self-reports.

Why are Faculty Development Programs Necessary?

We must turn now to a third question: "Why are faculty development and evaluation programs necessary?" Earlier this question was partially answered when we looked at the causes of the new interest in these two programs. We need better professional development and evaluation programs so that we can (1) halt the decline of financial resources and enrollments, (2) provide for the continued renewal and retraining of our aging and tenured-in faculties, (3) create new missions for our colleges, and (4) serve more fully the needs of an ever-expanding part-time teaching staff. There is, however, an even more important reason for having such programs than these and it is simply this. The success or failure of all institutions of higher learning depends upon the quality of their faculty evaluation and development program. (Notice I said "program." I still see the need for these two functions to be met in one comprehensive program.) In any postsecondary institution today that is truly meeting its goals will be found a strong faculty development and evaluation effort. The simple answer to the "Why?" question is that we cannot afford not to have these two programs if we hope to enhance student learning, expand our knowledge base and create a better society for future generations. There is no more important managerial responsibility for administrators to perform in higher education than the development of their institution's most important human resource--the faculty.

Answers to the "Why?" question can also be found through an examination of some of the purposes given for faculty development and evaluation. Let us take a look at some of the things that a combined

program might achieve at a college.

1. First, such a system can help an institution establish and meet its goals and objectives more fully.
2. Second, it can provide a means whereby an institution can build upon the strengths of individuals.
3. Third, it can result in the matching of organizational goals with personal goals at each level of the organization. Such matching, according to Argyris, Rensis Likert and other specialists in the fields of organization development and decision making, is a necessary activity for maintaining healthy organizations.
4. Fourth, it can for the first time in many institutions provide faculty evaluation systems that are supported directly by an extensive faculty development effort.
5. Fifth, such a combined program can provide for the first time the data necessary to evaluate the impact of faculty development and evaluation activity.
6. Next, it can result in a system whereby rewards for teaching, research and service are made on the basis of more objective criteria and more complete information than has been the case in the past.
7. Finally--and perhaps this is the most important purpose or reason for a combined faculty development and evaluation program--it can lead to an improved climate of learning for students.

In making this last point, I am reminded of a recent study by

Morstain and Gaff (1977) in which they asked 3,409 undergraduates at 16 diverse institutions to describe how they though teaching could be improved in their institutions. The students' top four responses were as follows:

a) Stimulate interest of students in subject matter (71%)
b) More enthusiasm conveyed by teachers for courses (63%)
c) Encourage more vigorous class discussions (61%)
d) Relate subject matter more to student interest (60%)

At the bottom of the student list of preferences were several items that were contrary to traditional notions among faculty about professional development. For instance, students thought the change that would least likely result in improved teaching was an increase in faculty knowledge of their subjects. This improvement (supported by such time-honored mechanisms as sabbatical leaves, research support, and travel to professional meetings) are the cornerstones of traditional approaches to the development of faculty. Based on this study, however, students seem to believe that their teachers were competent in their subjects; what they wanted to see were changes in the manner in which those subjects were taught. The point this research makes is that the most important reason for a combined or comprehensive faculty development and evaluation system is to serve the needs of students and not solely those needs identified by the faculty.

Another way of answering the question of "Why these two programs are necessary" can be found in looking at the benefits different types of individuals might derive from such programs.

One benefactor might be the senior faculty member--for example, the individual who has devoted 20-30 years or more to serving a particular college or university. Some ways that he/she might benefit

include: increased opportunities to try out new teaching strategies, support for released time to learn about new fields, and increased opportunities to work with junior faculty. The junior faculty member is another person who stands to benefit from such programs--e.g., the faculty member who has recently received tenure. Some ways that he or she might benefit from a faculty development and evaluation program include: new opportunities for an expanded research role; more opportunities for travel and professional exposure within his/her discipline, and the chance to develop new skills in workshops on instructional technology, curriculum development or grantsmanship.

New professors and instructors over the next ten to fifteen years also stand to benefit greatly from a comprehensive development and evaluation program. Through such a program they will gain a clearer understanding of their job responsibilities as well as their opportunities or lack of opportunities for advancement or reappointment. The professional development needs of the new instructor often differ greatly from those faculty who have acquired tenure or who could be classified as junior or senior faculty. The benefits of a strong development program for this fairly small group over the next few years are likely to take the form of: increased opportunities for career planning, help in the development of new teaching skills, and opportunities to learn new service or research skills.

Both service and research oriented faculty stand to benefit from comprehensive and expanded programming in the development and evaluation area. Under an individualized system of evaluation, the service-oriented professor may for the first time receive appropriate rewards

for his important committee work, advising of students, or contributions to local, state and national organizations. The research-oriented instructor should also gain recognition for his/her important contributions under the same system. Benefits to the part-time or full-time research might take the form of small faculty development grants for new research projects, released time to write up an important research report, or an opportunity to develop new teaching skills.

The college administrator benefits from a strong program in a variety of ways. Department chairperson returns, for example, should take the form of: increased department faculty morale; more information upon which to base such personnel decisions as reappointment, merit salary increases, tenure and promotion; and opportunities to provide real support for a faculty member's professional development needs. Upper echelon administrators should experience similar benefits, as well as the feelings of satisfaction that come from knowing that the institution's human resources are being used to their fullest potential. A more accurate knowledge of the faculty's strengths and weaknesses, more clearly defined and matched institutional and personal objectives, and increased opportunities to involve all of the faculty in long-range planning are but a few of other outcomes presidents, vice-presidents and college deans are likely to derive from a comprehensive plan for faculty development and evaluation.

Other beneficiaries include non-academic staff, part-time faculty, boards of trustees, and the many publics served by any one institution. But the most important beneficiary of our efforts in these two areas will be the college student. His returns should come in the form of

more enthusiastic and well-prepared instructors, greater faculty concerns for his educational needs, increased opportunities for more personalized and individualized instruction, and a more relevant curriculum.

Thus we see that answers to the question "Why are faculty development and evaluation programs necessary?" can be given in terms of the purposes of such programs and in terms of the benefits derived by system users. It has been argued in this section that a comprehensive system of faculty development and evaluation should not only halt some of the negative forces that are operating on colleges and universities today but that it should also provide new benefits for faculty, administrators and students.

HOW CAN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT AND EVALUATION WORK BEST?

Up to this point we have explored the origins, present nature, and reasons for faculty development and evaluation programs. This brings us to the fourth and final question "How can these two functions best be performed?" This is the most important question of the four because if we can find answers to it, then we will solve many of the problems facing higher education today. My answer to the question comes in two parts: first I will outline eight general principles for establishing a comprehensive faculty development and evaluation program. (Please note here that I am sticking to my earlier point that the most effective approach to the performance of these functions is one that combines faculty development and evaluation activities into one program.) Secondly, I will describe a comprehensive model that I believe would be suited for any two-year college, four year college, or university in our country.

The following eight principles have been developed by me and by

others who have worked with faculty development and evaluation programs over the last few years, in particular Anthony Grasha (1977). The eight general principles are as follows:

1. First Principle - No system is perfect. Each institution must develop a faculty development and evaluation program that best fits its own unique situation. Each new or revised system will have weaknesses that will have to be corrected from time to time. If such limitations do not crop up then in all likelihood the system is not being evaluated properly.

2. Second Principle - A faculty development and evaluation system should be broad based. Institutions should offer a variety of development programs to fit the different learning styles of faculty members and to fulfill the organizational and instructional development needs of the college or university. In the area of faculty evaluation the program should include periodic reviews of a faculty member's strength and weaknesses in each of the different areas of work. Such evaluations should also include the collection of evaluative information from as many sources as possible.

3. Third Principle - Development and evaluation should be linked to the reward structure of the organization. Faculty members need to know how they will be rewarded and to what degree for their participation in development and evaluation activities. Otherwise, as examples from higher education show, we can expect people to devote their energies to activities that traditionally count.

4. Fourth Principle - Evaluation is best considered as a process rather than a terminal event. There is an increasing tendency to think

of faculty evaluation as being formative in nature as opposed to being summative. For the most part our present evaluation systems are post-hoc or summative in nature. That is, people usually assume that the best time to evaluate is at the completion of an activity or at the end of an academic year. Most faculty however need assessment more than once in any given academic year.

5. Fifth Principle - An evaluation and development system should allow for individual differences and for the setting of personal goals and objectives. One fear people have of assessment systems in higher education is that they will find out they are not as good as they thought they were when compared to others. This fear can be overcome by an evaluation system that (a) allows for some individual differences, (b) uses a differential weighting system for faculty member goals and objectives, and (c) provides developmental support to help people meet their goals.

6. Sixth Principle - An evaluation and development system should maintain a personal and career growth orientation. Evaluation systems that exist solely for the collection of data for merit salary, tenure or promotion decisions are likely to prove ineffective. Such systems along with faculty development programs are likely to fail miserably unless consideration is given to the long-term personal and career goals of faculty members.

7. Seventh Principle - People who are effected by a faculty development and evaluation program should participate in its development. Of all the principles listed so far this may be the most important to follow. It is also one of the most violated principles today. Faculty need to be involved and kept informed of the development of a new or

revised program. The consequence of limited involvement will be a subverted system.

8. Eighth Principle - Personnel decisions should be made on the basis of both an objective quantification of assessment data as well as on a subjective basis. An easy route to follow in deciding who gets a salary raise, promotion, or reappointment is to develop a faculty evaluation system that assigns numbers to various kinds of performance. While such an approach is highly desirable because it helps faculty members think through their objectives, it should be recognized that subjectivity will always play a role in faculty evaluation plans.

Implementing a Comprehensive Faculty Development and Evaluation Program

There are three major components to a comprehensive model for faculty development which embodies the eight principles above. The first component relates to an institution's policies regarding faculty development and evaluation. I recommend that colleges and universities work toward the establishment of an institution-wide policy that describes faculty development and evaluation as components of one comprehensive system for professional improvement. This would be a change from our present approach which involves the establishment of separate policies for both of these areas. Such a policy statement would outline the major components required in departmental (divisional) faculty development and evaluation programs in the institution. The policy would also provide guidelines for evaluation and development at all other levels of the organization. It would stress the importance of comprehensive development and evaluation at the program area, department, or division level because it is here where the most effective development and evaluation can and must take place.

The greatest weakness of most faculty development and evaluation systems is that they have not attempted to initiate or stengthen development and evaluation activities in the department or division unit. Instead attention has been focused on the establishment of centers for the improvement of teaching or on institution-wide policy statements regarding faculty evaluation. These policy statements and centers are necessary. However, of much greater importance is the establishment of effective policies and comprehensive development and evaluation practices at the program, department or division level. For it is here where all faculty are likely to derive the greatest amount of benefit from a high quality development and evaluation effort. It is here where the most committed and creative faculty as well as those faculty most in need of assistance reside, along with that large middle category of "average performers." The administrator or faculty member who wants a faculty development and evaluation program for each faculty member must look to the department as the basic unit for such a program.

The second major component in the model, after an institution-wide policy has been approved by the faculty and administration, is the establishment of comprehensive faculty development and evaluation programs in each academic department or program area within the institution. Such departmentally based programs would be established in four steps. The first step would involve the preparation of a description of the purposes of the system. Here the objectives or desired outcomes of the development and evaluation programs would be clearly stated as a guide to the further development and operation of the program. The two main purposes for such a system might be stated as follows: (1) to provide data for

making fair and appropriate personnel decisions, and (2) to provide assistance or stimulation for faculty development and improvement.

The next step in my departmental model involves the identification of the essential elements of the program. The four essential elements of any development and evaluation program are objectives, criteria, standards and evidence. Objectives are the attainments or accomplishments that faculty hope to achieve under each development and evaluation area. Criteria are specific measurable outcomes subsumed under each objective and performance area. Standards are the levels of attainment which are expected or defined for each criterion. Evidence is data or information gathered as the basis for determining performance levels for each development and evaluation criterion. Evidence would also include the methodology used in gathering data. These four elements--objectives, criteria, standards, and evidence are central to the success of this model.

The establishment of procedures would be the last step in setting up the model. Procedures are defined here as the steps designated by a flow chart or other device for examining and applying the evidence to determine the level of achievement for each person's development and evaluation objectives and criterion. The clearer these procedures are, the more likely it is that sound personnel decisions will be made and effective development programs will be established.

With these steps or elements in mind, this is how a developmental or program area development and evaluation program might work. First, the department chairperson and his/her faculty would determine the department's goals for a 3-5 year period in accordance with the college or university's missions statements. Then, each year the department faculty would determine

its goals, ranking them in terms of priority, as well as standards for faculty performance. This process would take place each Spring prior to the new academic year. In accordance with the department's faculty development and evaluation policy, the faculty of the department would then prepare their professional development goals for the coming year keeping in mind the department's goals for the year. These development plans would state the faculty members objectives for the year in each of the department's areas for development and evaluation, i.e., teaching, service, research, advising, publications, etc. These plans would then be reviewed by the department chair and one or two other faculty in a Spring conference. Once approved, all of the faculty members in the department would receive copies of each other's development objectives and/or plans for the coming year.

Another unique aspect of this system and perhaps the most important element would be the department's faculty development fund. This fund would equal 1-3% of each department's budget and would be under the control of the department chairperson. Each Spring when the faculty members submitted their development plans they would also submit a development budget. Development funds would then be awarded from this fund by the chairperson or the chairperson and his/her advisory faculty committee according to departmental goals, the quality of projects proposed, and the faculty member's needs. Such a funding system would clearly indicate to the faculty that the institution is serious about its professional development responsibilities. It would also show the faculty that the administration feels that development is important for <u>all</u> faculty, not just those few who make use of the institution's Center for the Improvement of Teaching. It would

also demonstrate that the administration believes that faculty evaluation cannot be performed effectively without a strong developmental support system. Other benefits from the establishment of departmental faculty development funds would include the following: (1) development funds awarded for departmental as well as individual needs, (2) the realization on the part of department chairs that they have a development as well as an evaluation role to play, and (3) increased faculty morale and committment to the goals of their department and college or university.

The system proposed would require that the chairperson and the faculty member agree on a weighting system for each of the faculty member's development and evaluation objectives. In other words, there would be an assignment of percentage weights to each of the faculty member's anticipated performance categories. This would mean that faculty members could negotiate a variety of workload arrangements with weights for any given performance category ranging from 0 to 100. Such weights would help the faculty member in the allocation of his/her time and would provide a fairer basis for evaluation of the faculty member's performance at the end of any given year.

In the Fall of the new academic year, the department chair would meet with the faculty member and his development team or colleagues for a progress report. At this time changes would be permitted in the development plan in terms of objectives, criteria, standards, weights and evidence required. These changes would be negotiated between the chair and the faculty member with the help of the faculty member's development team. This part of the program would be the formative evaluation stage of the system for both development and evaluation purposes.

In the Spring of that same academic year, the faculty member would prepare an annual report of his/her accomplishments as well as a development plan for the next year. This report and development plan would be reviewed in a conference by the department chair and the faculty member's development team. A copy of this report would then be given to all faculty in the department for their review and evaluation. Each faculty member would be asked to evaluate the reports of each colleague in light of departmental goals, standards, and the faculty assigning a rating of 1-4 to the faculty member's overall performance as well as to his/her performance in each of the appropriate performance category. These rankings would be sent back to the department chairperson for summary and inclusion in each faculty member's summative evaluation for the year for purposes of reappointment, merit salary increases, the awarding of tenure or promotion. This form of colleague evaluation would be a great improvement over the types of colleague evaluation systems that we are using today.

The department chair would then determine his/her overall evaluation of this faculty member's performance for the year. In arriving at this evaluation the chairperson would have formative and summative evaluation data from the faculty member's colleagues, from students, and from the faculty member's own self-assessment. He would assign ratings of 1-4 to each faculty member's overall performance as well as to the faculty member's performance in each of his annual report performance categories. These ratings by the chair would be based on colleague ratings and self-report ratings by the faculty member and would form part or all of the basis for the chairperson's recommendations for personnel reappointment, salary increases, tenure awards, and promotion. (In cases where tenure

and promotion are being considered in any given year the department faculty and chairperson may want to set up additional procedures for making those decisions. However, data gathered from the approach recommended should also be very useful to the faculty member as well as any special review committees for promotion and tenure purposes.)

What are the advantages of such a system? There are at least six major ones:

1. Faculty are more likely to view evaluation in a favorable light than they would under more traditional forms of faculty evaluation. This system would reduce the fear and threat factors often associated with former types of faculty evaluation. Positive support for the system would develop because its main emphasis is on development. As long as faculty receive support and rewards for their development efforts under this system, these positive feelings would continue.
2. Department chairpersons will be able to perform their development and evaluation responsibilities more effectively. This would be possible because as a group they would be better informed as to the needs of their faculties and would for the first time in many cases have the resources to help them meet these needs as they arise.
3. Faculty morale, job satisfaction, and commitment to departments should be greatly increased by this system provided adequate rewards are found for faculty development efforts. Research in both industry and education shows that people demonstrate higher levels of the above mentioned characteristics when they are more fully involved in the evaluation and development process.

4. Institutions will benefit from a greater achievement of their goals and objectives. For the first time in many institutions of higher learning there will be an attempt to match individual goals with individual needs and objectives. Theorists claim and research supports their contention that such a matching process results in increased organizational goal attainment.
5. It will be possible to determine more effectively the impact of faculty development and evaluation programs on faculty and students. This system will create more data than previous development and evaluation approaches. These data can be used in determining program impact at all levels of the organization.
6. Postsecondary institutions will be making the best use of their human resources. For the first time in many institutions faculty workloads will be individualized to focus on faculty strengths as opposed to asking each faculty member to perform the same tasks.

This has been a discussion of the second component in a faculty development and evaluation system--a comprehensive departmental faculty development and evaluation program. The first component in the model was the establishment of an institution-wide policy that described faculty development and evaluation as a comprehensive system for professional improvement. The third and last major component of my model program is the development of a college or university-wide center for professional and organizational development. This center would offer the following support services to departments and individuals throughout the college: (1) personal development services, (2) instructional development services, (3) organization development services, and (4) program evaluation services.

The director of such a center would report to the Vice-President of Academic Affairs or the Dean(s) of Instruction. He or she would have a staff as opposed to a line appointment as would any staff members who joined the center. One of the primary goals of the center would be to determine the faculty development and evaluation needs of the institution and to then work with departments and upper echelon administrators in meeting those needs. Its main purpose would be to improve the quality of faculty development and evaluation practices in each of the college's departments. Another major goal of the center would be to help the faculty and adminstration of the college coordinate the institution's faculty development and evaluation activities as one unified program. The only institution-wide progams that such a center might sponsor for faculty and/or administrators would be those that could not be conducted more efficiently and effectively within the departmental or administrative unit. For example, the center might sponsor workshops for department chairpersons who would like to improve their skills in the areas of faculty development and evaluation. Or they might run a workshop for faculty from a number of departments who through their development plans have expressed an interest in learning more about Personalized Systems of Instruction (PSI). The extent of services offered by such a center would all depend on the amount of resources it was awarded. However, regardless of the amount of resources awarded, its major focus would be to help departments or program areas set up the best possible development and evaluation program for their faculties.

Space will not permit details as to some of the newer approaches to faculty development that such a center as this might undertake. Other chapters in this volume deal with this. To summarize, an ideal faculty

development and evaluation model contains the following three major components: (1) a comprehensive institution-wide policy regarding faculty development and evaluation, (2) an emphasis on the establishment of comprehensive and well-supported departmental faculty development and evaluation programs, and (3) the establishment of a Center for Professional and Organization Development that would provide faculty development and evaluation services to the major administrative units of the institution.

Chapter III

Who Needs Faculty Development -- And Why

Richard I. Miller

This volume covers just about every significant dimension of faculty development, and is timely. The conference title is of special interest: Academic Work. It is one of the very few times, if not the first, that someone chose to call what we do "work." Have you ever tried to define "work?" Is it sustained effort toward ends; is it what we do for a living, or at least what our job description says we do; or is it the expenditure of effort in one's occupational endeavors? And if we have trouble with a definition of work, how about "academic"? Perhaps it will suffice to say that if any of us wrote about some of the non-fiction that we encounter in academe, it would sound like far out fiction!

Let us begin with five postulates or generalizations about the topic. Any semblance between these postulates and reality is purely intentional.

1. Nobody needs faculty development because (1) those what want it, don't; and (2) those who need it, won't!

Table 1 below is from Centra's 1976 study. It rather dramatially points out that the better teachers want to improve while those who need it, don't. Also, younger and nontenured faculty members are quite interested in faculty development--as one would suspect.

Insert Table 1

These findings raise the next question: what can be done about faculty members who need to improve but don't want to do so. Colleges and universities increasingly need to develop policies and procedures

Table 1

Estimated Extent to Which Various Groups of Faculty Have Been Involved in Development Activities

	Percentage of 756 institutional respondents indicating:				
	Very few	Some	About half	Most	No response
1. Younger faculty in their first years of teaching	13	31	23	27	06
2. Faculty with over 15 or 20 years of teaching experience	22	45	17	09	07
3. Nontenured faculty	08	34	25	19	14
4. Tenured faculty	09	41	23	10	17
5. Good teachers who want to get better	03	21	28	43	05
6. Faculty who really need to improve	40	38	08	06	08

that require ineffective teachers to undertake some sort of developmental activities. Of course, this is much easier said than done, and perhaps a more realistic aspiration would be to sensitize deans and departmental chairpersons to the matter. More about this matter later.

2. Everyone supports faculty development--for somebody else.

No one like to be developed--our children, our dogs and cats, our marital partners, and last--and foremost--professors. (Unless it be administrators.) Those who complete the sometimes intellectual obstacle course known as Ph.D. downs, are likely to confer upon themselves some excellence in teaching whether the result of watching various models administering to them, through clues gained from reading, from experience or from somewhere else.

The process of imparting knowledge, also, is considered very secondary to the content by some scholars. We all know professors whose content obsession places them oblivious to anything known as pedagogy. The position goes something like this: "There is only content; the process will take care of itself. I can barely master the content: If I know what I am about, so will others." This logic is entirely suitable to one communicating to colleagues but not to students. Where students are involved, this attitude is in the best traditions of the 19th century.

3. All institutions support faculty development--morally and spiritually.

Who can be against night baseball, healthy babies or low taxes? What institution can afford not to support faculty development? The rub is: how much and what kind?

No one among these readers needs to be told bout fiscal austerity, retrenchment and the like; these conditions are with us every day. How

can administrators, then, find human and material resources to support faculty developoment? The answer is quite simple: Support will be found if these activities have sufficiently high priority status. Some funds are always available or things that the institution really believes in.

Table 2 adapted from John Centra's study of faculty development indicates the funding picture.

Insert Table 2

And we are not talking about sizable funds. Faculty development funding can be reasonably modest if creativity and contributed resources are prominent. But some funding is essential for a viable and dynamic program. The willingness of an institution to contribute this modicum is a measure of its real commitment to professional development.

4. Faculty development oftengives the individual good feelings about teaching without interfering with student learning.

How often does faculty development nibble at the fringes of learning without getting to the heart of the matter? How many faculty development programs tinker with techniques rather than getting into the teacher-learner interaction, one's own teaching philosophy, or individual differences among teachers and learners?

Careful thought needs to be given to how faculty development can be individualized to meet varying needs and interests. For example, one professor may want to develop a videotape on Chinese art, another senses a need for better rapport with students, and another wants to develop better means of developing student evaluation procedures. A variety of available faculty development activities presupposes a well-defined overall effort.

Table 2

Funding Sources for Each Type of Institution

Proportion of total budget from:	Two-Year Colleges N=307	Four-Year Colleges N=295	Universities N=83
Institutional general fund	70	67	71
Grants from federal government or foundation	16	27	15
Direct funds from state	11	3	8
Other	3	3	6

5. Faculty development programs are being evaluated carefully and systematially using the calibrated eyeball and impressively modulated words.

New programs enjoy freedom from evaluation. Whether it be lifelong learning, instructional television, competency-based education, or faculty development, new developments are evaluated as an afterthought. And not without reason. Developmental stages require much effort and enthusiasm, and things are happening so fast that evaluation is subsumed by action. The paucity of current evaluation is indicated on Table 3 adapted from Centra's study.

Insert Table 3

But sooner or later, preferably sooner, questions about evaluation arise, as Al Smith notes in an earlier chapter in this book. We are now at this point with faculty development. One can approach evaluation in a number of ways. Tight experimental research designs that seek to discern whether student learning is improved as a result of faculty development remain to be developed. Such evidence is needed. More accessible and therefore more common methods of evaluation consist of survey data and/or case studies. A very recent evaluation report of a three-year faculty development project was given three weeks ago by Dr.Jerry Gaff at the American Association for Higher Education:

> The need for teaching improvement--only one aspect of faculty development but the one in which I am most involved--still exists; the considerable progress that has been made has in no way satiated the need. Evidence can be seen everywhere. On the questionnaire survey we conducted early in our Project, fully 40 percent of the faculty said never during their entire career had anyone talked with them in detail about

Table 3

Evaluation of Faculty Development Programs or Activities

Has there been an evaluation of the faculty development program or activities at your institution?

	All Institutions	Two-Year Colleges	Four-Year Colleges	Universities
	N=756	N=326	N=315	N=93
	Percentage Responding			
Yes	14	19	10	12
No	48	42	53	52
Only in part	33	35	31	31
No response	5	4	5	5

> their teaching; only one in four said this happened more than twice. Or consider the professor who confessed to me, I've been teaching introductory chemistry for 17 years,and I need to be renewed;" he expressed a yearning felt by many of his more reticent colleagues. Or note the national survey conducted by the Carnegie Commission in which approximately one-third of the faculty agreed with the statement, Knowledge in my field is expanding so fast that I have fallen seriously behind. Despite the progress that has been made, there are still large numbers of faculty members, even on campuses that have initiated new programs, who have not yet been touched and could benefit from greater attention to their teaching, professional lives, and subject matter.
>
> In sum, we should keep in mind that faculty development is a recent phenomenon, that it embraces several schools of thought; that although much progress has been made, many needs remain; that it is a continuous process; and that even successful programs are vulnerable. But the evidence is beginning to accumulate that allows us to judge its worth. This evidence supports the conclusion that faculty development has yielded significant benefits to faculty members, administrators, institutions, and students.

Who needs development?

The obvious answer is everyone--and quite regularly. Some years ago during a few days stay at Inuvik in the Northwest Territories in Canada, some 700 miles north of the Arctic Circle, the weekly newspaper, actually a few mimeographed pages, captured the essence of learning in this one liner: "When you're through learning, you're through."

Four factors are prominent in the current growth of faculty development. They are: greater emphasis on classroom teaching, quicker obsolescence of knowledge, economic austerity, and diminished professional mobility. But these are commonplace reasons, and you can suggest others. I would like to return to the question: "Who needs development," and

discuss this question in terms of five categories of people who need development. First,

Those who have the flats. Middle age professors may go "flat." Their degree work is in the distant past, their family is out of secondary school, they have fought and thought their way through the mystical labyrinth leading to the full professoriate and tenure, and they have been through their lecture notes a dozen or two times. Claude Mathis has spoken of this time in these terms: "The mid-career crisis for faculty should be recognized for what it is--a need for new directions in teaching and scholarship as well as a quest for new experiences in the context of an already well-established professional commitment. Faculty development efforts must recognize the senior faculty member as a legitimate concern if effective programs of teaching and learning are to be sustained."

Those who have the wrong field is a second category of those who need faculty development. A few institutions have taken faculty re-development seriously, and more will do so if professional mobility possibilities continue to diminish. Colleges and universities have not done much sustained thinking about this matter. One evidence of sustained thought might be a grid showing expected growth and decline patterns for the next three to six years. Such data can be a basis for planning for re-development.

The extent that re-development is available is a function of money and interest. Special leave programs can be used for this purpose although the number of such programs is directly related to available funds. And only scattered interest in career re-direction is another factor. A limited number of professors can be enticed or persuaded to abandon their chosen discipline. A few, however, will be pleased to do so believing

that they made a professional mistake in the first place.

Those who perform with mediocrity constitute a third category. Considerable time and thought needs to be given to finding ways of encouraging those who are performing poorly. There are ways of friendly persuasion for such individuals but each case is unique and needs to be approached in that light. The problem becomes more difficult when an individual simply does not want to be developed. What do you do? There are several alternatives. One is do nothing. And I am afraid that this backing-into-the-future approach is not uncommon. Another is severance from the institution. This alternative becomes a bit more complicated if the individual is tenured. Incompetence, which can be identified in the normal range of competence found in any group, including professors and/or administrators, is known but virtually impossible to prove in academe. In this respect, our profession closely resembles the civil service. A third approach is through compulsory re-development, or, what do we do when persuasion does not work? A few institutions have put teeth into this dimension of development by requiring individuals to undertake a prescribed program to improve performance. Results of such efforts have received little attention from evaluators thus far.

Those who want to improve constitutes a sizable minority. Evidence by Centra that was presented earlier indicates the irony of better teachers having much greater motivation to improve than others in greater need. This group is the easiest of the five to deal with although their already acknowledged success presents a different type of challenge. They are usually beyond the more elemental needs and require more sophisticated approaches. Also, members of this group are the candidates for innovative

approaches because they tend to be more secure and therefore less threatened by trying something different--and they are also more likely to be successful in their new endeavors.

Those who need pedagogical help. This category relates more specifically to what has been related earlier; namely, that subject matter competence is no guarantee of teaching effectiveness. Various methods of ascertaining teaching effectiveness, such as student rating systems, self-evaluation, colleague review, and classroom peer evaluation can be helpful in discerning strengths and weaknesses. When weaknesses or deficiencies are found, then the College must have procedures that will provide assistance.

How does your college cope with this matter? A number of creative ways may be used. One college teamed an ameanable college with the one having difficulty. Meetings were scheduled during the semester after the colleague had visited the individual's classroom. This system worked quite well. One large state university has an office designed to assist individuals with pedagogical problems. The referrant system is via department chairpersons and deans. Another medium size public regional university flags poor student rating records at the assistant vice presidential level and returns this information to the department via the deans for consultation and possible assistance. This taste of the considerable diversity in approaching pedagogical improvement adds up to two crucial concepts: institutional procedures and individualized creativity.

A conceptual model for faculty development

The five basic components on Table 4 are considered to be the essence of faculty development. In each instance some questions are raised that may be helpful in making a one to ten evaluation of the extent to which this component is being met in the various academic-related functions. AN "NA", for not applicable, may be used where appropriate; a "P" for planning may be used for components in the planning stages; and a "D" for desirable components that are not in place or in planning.

Course improvement

To what extent are course improvement opportunities available to individual faculty members? Course improvement in contrast with teaching improvement refers more to mechanics and techniques related to courses and programs. For an excellent summary of current instructional methods -- lecture, discussions, seminars, independent study, self-instruction, instructional technology, computer-assisted instruction, computer-managed instruction, programmed instruction, television instruction, multi-media instruction, videotape and videodisc, contract learning, experiential learning, module instruction, audio-tutorial system, personalized self-instruction, and other methods -- See Charles Cole, To Improve Instruction. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report. No. 2. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Suite 78[illegible], 20036, 1978.

Institutional renewal

Are faculty development programs contributing to institutional renewal? Institutional renewal may be described as a process more

Table 4

A Conceptual Framework for

Evaluating an Institution's Faculty

Development Program

Basic Components

	Course Improvement			Institutional Renewal			Teaching Improvement			Personal Development		Professional Updating				
	Technological aids	Course modifications	Campus assistance	Institutional-wide concern	Support of faculty development	Excellence Awards	Workshops	Campus faculty development programs	Campus assistance	Personal development	Campus assistance	Sabbaticals	Leaves	Institutes	Conferences	
Administration																
Advising																
Course/program																
Teaching																
Research																
Service																

A value of one to ten can be developed for each applicable item.

than a product and one which is identified by vitality, willingness to try new approaches, and a sense of direction. Measurement of institutional renewal is more by faith than by research evidence although Gaff's survey of those schools participating in that study indicated some institution-wide accomplishments, as outlined in Table 5.

Table 5

Major Accomplishments

	Presidents Vice Presidents	Team	Faculty	Deans Chairpersons
Climate more supportive of teaching	65%	59	37	49
Improved teaching techniques	45	44	35	37
Enriched interpersonal relationships	25	41	13	39
Curriculum improvement	15	15	3	12
Individual enrichment	15	7	9	8
Institutionalized renewal efforts	5	8	7	16
None, don't know, no answer	20	3	30	18

Total percentages exceed 100% because up to three responses per person were possible.

Teaching improvement

Are ways and means for developing better teaching methods and techniques readily accessible to the faculty? These would include evaluation of teaching with subsequent modifications, seminars and workshops, experimentation with new techniques of teaching, and others. Measurement may include appraisal by students, self-analyses, and consultation.

Personal development

Do campus faculty development programs include opportunities for those who are weary, those who are discouraged, those who are confused? How effective is this component of faculty development? Measurement is through surveys and personal case studies. The section on "Personal Development" in the handbook by William Bergquist and Steven Phillips (1975) is excellent. At one point, they outline these suggestions for the interviewer-interviewee relationship.

"A. What is helpful from the consultee's point of view?

1. An atmosphere of friendliness and trust.
2. Acceptance by consultant
3. Consultant listens attentively.
4. Consultant emphasizes, rather than sympathizes.
5. Consultant paraphrases and summarizes.
6. Consultant helps clarify issues and diagnose problem.
7. Consultant helps to explore alternatives.
8. Consultant does not give advice.
9. Consultant takes a mutual approach to problem-solving.
10. A sense of progress in understanding the problem.

B. What is helpful from the consultant's point of view?

1. Client sets limits to the problem being dealt with.
2. Client recognizes the problem as his own rather than as the consultant's.
3. Client is willing to accept the limitations as well as the strengths of the consultant.
4. Client accepts feelings of the consultant as legitimate and helpful.

Professional updating

Do optimal opportunities exist for growth in one's discipline or professional field? Opportunities include sabbatical and other kinds of leaves, workshops and seminars, faculty retreats, and visits to other institutions. Measurement is quite difficult although more manageable than is evident today. Sabbaticals, for example, can be evaluated to some extent by comparing the sabbatical report with the initial work plan to see the extent of fulfillment.

In conclusion, faculty development is an investment in the future, which is where every institutional will be for the rest of its existence. And a not exactly new thought: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Faculty development will not be easy in the next few years, but few things will. We know enough to develop, maintain, and evaluate outstanding programs in faculty development, and a few such efforts can be identified. Why don't we have more? Perhaps Cassius's words to Brutus are relevant: "Our fate, dear Brutus, is not in the stars, but in ourselves."

Chapter IV

Organizational Problems in Setting Up Faculty Development Programs

Ronald K. Boyer

In starting and maintaining a faculty development program over a 5-10 year period, three major organizational areas must be addressed as follows: (1) the politics of survival--the program's legitimization by the institution, (2) the internal management of the faculty development agency, and (3) strategies for intervention and relating to clients.

Political survival involves having the faculty development agency legitimized and sponsored by the power structure. The agency needs a budget and an organizational location. In a strictly bureaucratic sense legitimization comes from the central administration. In the broader sense, the agency's survival is linked to the supra institutional political process which includes the central administration, faculty, board, community, and the legislative as well as other interest groups.

The internal management of a faculty development agency has to do with the types of staff members chosen and how they work together. Internal management of the agency effects the care and feeding of the agency staff, and their capacity to deliver resources to the faculty, students, and administration in the institution, to assist them in innovation and development. Also it influences the match or congruence between staff styles and the needs of the institution.

Strategies for intervention relate to getting people and organizational units to participate in developmental activities--such involvement is critical for success. Processes for building relationships must be initiated in ways that encourage individuals and groups to begin to trust

agency members and to become open to the possibility that they can be helpful. The generic organizational processes have to do with developing credibility in the system--something that takes time and is developmental. Typically this process proceeds from simple to complex tasks, from short-term to long-term projects, and from individuals to groups and organizational units. Moreover, the process will be influenced by personal and disciplinary styles of agency staff as well as those of clients. Building agency credibility is slow and tedious. When a new agency starts, staff can be frustrated and impatient. The literature on organizational development suggests that change projects start at the top of the institution with sponsorship from the top. This approach seems to work in industrial organizations which have linearity in their formal and informal power structures. Higher education institutions seem to have more diffuse power structures which necessitate more flexible and opportunistic approaches.

It is my intention to develop each of the above organizational areas with more definition, some case examples and some hopefully useful general principles which can be incorporated in many institutions. First, however, some introductory, qualifying, and stage-setting remarks.

In an earlier chapter, Al Smith included the following in faculty development programs: faculty development/professional development (individual growth), instructional development (classroom and curriculum improvement) and organizational development (institutional and system improvement). These distinctions are useful and this chapter links reasonably well with them. It is not my primary purpose to define faculty development _per se_ (Jerry Gaff's book _Toward Faculty Renewal_, 1975, performs that task admirably). I do want to say that I see faculty development as

part of the generic process dealing with growth, change and innovation in higher education. In discussing faculty development agencies or people in colleges and departments designated in those roles, we are talking about third party interventions into the system to impart skills or facilitate change and growth. As a word of caution, innovation comes about in a variety of ways, both planned and unplanned. Faculty development happens to represent one role model or orientation to it.

The goal of faculty development ought to be to encourage and sustain innovation and those concerned with it ought to be (at least in a spiritual sense) delighted if it happens--regardless of whose responsibility. Unfortunately, getting a hat on one's head that says "you are responsible for innovation" can be debilitating because one can think that "it is I who has to perform and carry all this responsibility." Similarly, if one is labeled as a teacher, one can feel that one has to teach people instead of joining them in a learning process; or when one gets appointed as a department head or a dean, one feels a necessity to lead rather than join one's faculty or department heads in a form of collaboration. So, when getting new hats and labels which cast one in "grand roles," it is important not to get hooked by their literal meaning and take oneself too seriously.

To give a frame of reference for my comments I will share a brief history of the past dozen or so years of faculty development at the University of Cincinnati. IRTHE (Institution for Research and Training in Higher Education) now called the Faculty Resource Center (FRC) was created in 1965 with a Director, a couple of graduate students, a secretary and a few thousand dollars of general funds. It was created by a group of senior faculty who wanted to improve teaching. The first director served a year

and sought another position; the position then remained open for a year. I arrived on the scene in 1967 as the Assistant Director, and Campbell Crockett, a former dean and senior faculty member, became the Director. That was our organization continuity until 1971. In 1971 he became permanent Dean of Arts and Sciences, prior to that time having been Dean of Graduate School. I became Director--that phase lasting until 1974. In 1974-75, while I was on sabbatical, we reorganized and restructured from IRTHE to what is now known as the Faculty Resource Center. Tony Grasha is the Director of the Faculty Resource Center, our current form. We are being phased out at the end of this summer (1978) due primarily to budgetary reasons, but there are some situational issues that relate to that.

During this period, we have served over 1,000 faculty and 35-40 academic departments. We have had clients ranging all the way from secretaries to the president of the university. We have had short-term and long-term projects in the faculty development area of personal growth; instruction development all the way through a change of the entire curriculum of the Department of Architecture; and organizational development, including my serving for a couple of years as coordinator for long-range planning for the institution. A fourth focus has been a minority program that I started in 1967, to get blacks and Appalachian whites into the university for Master's work (an ongoing project which, by the way, will not be phased out). Minority programs are being retained. Similarly, our media services' function, which is now a part of Faculty Resource Center, is being retained but moved to the library.

I do not want to present our situation as typical, but I do want to share some learning from what we have done. I think we have had some

substantial successes and I want to share some principles that will hopefully be helpful.*

The Politics of Survival: The Program Legitimization by the Institution

Faculty development efforts, whether they be efforts of an individual, a project group, or an agency, need some form of legitimization and sponsorship, and this includes the following kinds of elements:

1. An Organizational Home. A place on the organization chart connected to a vice president, dean, or department head. Where one appears on the organization chart depends upon the constituency to be served. If the mission is seen as institution-wide, then the office of the academic vice president is where one should report for maximum symbolic credibility and potential economic support. Attempts to focus on subunits of the institution should have a home connected to the highest ranking academic officer within that unit.

2. Economic Support. Someone is needed who is authorized to establish a budget line for staff, supplies, conferences, etc. Hopefully, this person will also help ward off competing needs for fiscal support. How much budget is required for such a function is hard to indicate. Institutions vary enormously in size and individual wealth. On the average, educational institutions spend very little on training and development compared to industrial organizations. Our general funds budget for the last several years has been about $100,000 for faculty development staff; $100,000 for

*For those who want to know something about the history of the Center, there is a piece by Campbell Crockett called the "Higher Education Institute" in the Journal of Higher Education, May 1973.

media services; and $80,000 for a minority scholarship program. Traditionally we have raised a few thousand dollars a year via grants and consultations. That is a relatively large budget, but it was based on rather a large client system of 19 colleges, 1500 faculty, and 34,000 students. With the faculty development portion of our budget ($100,000), we funded four Ph.D. level staff (half-time in the Center and half-time in their academic departments), three or four graduate students, three secretaries, and a supplies budget. In 1965, the Center started with a budget a third that size and increased every year until about 1972-73. At the other end of the spectrum, Omar Milton has been a one person operation at the University of Tennessee for several years and done very well. For a couple of years before budget restrictions eliminated it, there was an additional $50,000 per year allocated to the University Educational Council. The council reported to the vice president for academic affairs, was separate from our Center, although our staff served on it, and its function was to give faculty small grants for teaching improvement (e.g., $500 to develop materials). The University of Michigan uses somewhat larger grants.

Basically, a faculty development budget must be scaled to the institution. As a practical matter, the question usually is how much the market will bear.

3. Access to Information. To be inventive and adapt to changing needs, information about the ebb and flow of the institution is critical. This information can come from a variety of sources, formal and informal, but especially from the person to whom the faculty development agency reports. We found an efficient way to stay updated was to get the director of our agency invited to attend the bi-weekly dean's meetings conducted by the

vice president. Such a setting is very helpful to acquire information, to assess institutional climate, and to identify strategic places where the agency might offer assistance. In fact in 1973, the then newly appointed vice president did not invite us to those meetings and it hurt our ability to adapt as well as be helpful. We suspect this was also a factor in closing of the Center.

4. Being Understood. It is helpful if the person reported to understands what the agency is doing in the substantive sense, and it is ideal if he/she is sympathetic. However, neither of those is essential or perhaps even attainable. I recognize this point violates common sense, but I think it is true--at least it has practical utility. What is essential is that this person buy into a set of priorities (real or symbolic)--e.g., to improve teaching or to do renewal with "tenured in" faculties in a time of retrenchment. It is not as important that they understand what the agency does as it is for them to be sympathetic to the need for money and for their political support. We academics have strong needs to deal with the substance of what we do. In this case, substance is less important than the processes of coalition formation and maintenance.

It is equally important to head off situations which would embarrass or threaten the agency's organizational sponsor. Leaders do not like "surprises" that catch them "off guard." If they feel "threatened," the faculty development unit can be threatened with loss of sponsorship.

5. Organizational Location. In terms of overall credibility, I think it is useful to report to an academic function (academic affairs, a dean of a college, a department head). Such a reporting relationship attaches the faculty development agency to the academic function, and that is where

the political and economic power is in colleges and universities. Ideally, if a campus-wide constituency is desired, then the vice-president of Academic Affairs should be the unit with which an authority relationship is established. The task is to identify with the highest level of administrative support relevant to the client system.

6. Faculty Advisory Function and Support. Frequently, a faculty development project starts with concerned faculty groups who want to improve some aspects of a course, department, a curriculum, how graduate students are trained, etc. This kind of activitiy typically leads to a position paper or proposal that is marketed or sold to an administrator who provides some money or agrees to sign off on a grant proposal. Next can follow an agency or project office which is given some sort of organizational status and/or location--the other points I make above. Hopefully, the agency thrives, expands, and changes to meet new individual and institutional needs.

The faculty advisory function should be continued beyond the initial start-up of the agency or function. Too often the early supporters are forgotten as the staff of the agency "get hooked" on the excitement of what they are doing. The political aspects of survival can be forgotten along with the need to "keep your friends on board." Retaining an advisory group has several functions. First, they can remain sympathetic faculty constituents, and, as friends, they will give advice if they hear about potential problems or trouble in situations where the agency "goofed" or inadvertantly did something and did not know about it. Second, an administrator who respects faculty opinion will impute value to the agency's efforts when respectable and/or high status faculty keep its company. Some of the

advisory group will probably want to do more and develop their own skills to consult with other faculty. Finally, agency advisors can be asked to lobby and fight for it during budget processes. Sometimes a senior faculty member can get a hearing with the president or the vice president when the agency head can not.

Essential Political Nature of Survival

The preceding elements of legitimization and sponsorship for faculty development agencies/projects are more or less straightforward. They do hint a bit at what I believe is the essentially political aspect of survival. Now for a more explicit elaboration of that theme.

Policy making and resource allocation at the central administrative level is a political process involving constituencies, lobbying, and power politics. Useful references, if you have not looked at them, are Victor Baldridge's book, Power and Conflict in the University (1971), and the Cohen and March book, Leadership and Ambiguity (1974). Cohen and March reviewed many of the concepts of formal organizational theory (e.g., bureaucracy, authoritarianism, matrix and task organization) and concluded that none of them really fits the university. The concept of "organized anarchy" did, so they came up with the notion of the "garbage can" theory of management to reflect the particularly idiosyncratic and/or irrational ways in which decisions tend to be made in higher education especially under conditions of rapid change.

Because educational institutions are complex political systems, survival of faculty development programs is only in part dependent upon doing solid work. Solid work is necessary but not sufficient. Solid work is important, and that is all the fun in faculty development, but it is

a necessary, not sufficient condition. How the agency and its head and organizational sponsor "play the game" influences the long-term prospects, especially in retrenchment and hard times. Now some examples.

Sponsors. First of all the sponsor (vice president, dean, or department head) sits at a "crunch point" in the system involving political pressures and competing demands. As such they have short memories. Thus, they regularly wonder "what have you done for me lately." It is helpful to treat them (vice president, dean and department head) as clients and take care of their feeding--they get lonely, they feel frustrated, they feel misunderstood and not helped by people. They are accustomed to meeting with uncooperative people who are mad at them. So one of the ways to get credits in the system is for the agency head to be collaborative and helpful. This means taking on some projects that help the sponsor (e.g., providing policy consultation, covering a meeting for them, doing a workshop for their staff). Initially, they will tend to be a bit distrustful because it so deviates from their normal experience. Later there may be a problem of limiting the agency's involvement with them so that other projects can be done. Remember, the game is to influence them.

Being systematic in telling the sponsor what the agency is doing is another important dimension. This involves verbal and written reports two to three times a year and not just at budget time. When budget time comes, it is too late. Budget time is like harvesting, if support has not been planted and nurtured ahead of time, trouble arises. The reporting process must be tailored to the style of your leader. The initiative rests with the development agency. Vice presidents will not call to talk about how it is going--they are too busy.

Justification. There have to be visable attempts at justification. The reporting pattern mentioned above is one of them. Because the results of faculty development are hard to define, we have found that head counts and description of activities are the best. We do quarterly reports that go out to vice presidents, deans, and department heads. We also forward research reports on individual projects when this seems appropriate and when permission is granted by the client system.

There is a sense in which "if you are asked to justify yourself, you are in trouble." Justification and evaluation seem rational enough because that is what good scientists do--it is a scientific method. But at the political level in relationship to faculty development, it means that the agency is in political trouble and faced with the loss of sponsorship and "bucks." Requests for justification are always a cause for worry.

Visible activities which have high face validity add most to credibility (e.g., public offerings of workshop on teaching and learning, Keller plan, group discussion, faculty evaluation, etc.). We have found that frequently what is most public and visable adds most to our credibility and more than our in depth, substantive projects with a department or a group of faculty. The reason for this, according to Thompson (1967), has to do with the certainty of results. When the intrinsic merit of an activity is uncertain and indeterminant, leaders rely on extrinsic indicators. Thus, a well-dressed, fashionable, visable police force may be presumed to be doing a better job than a sloppily dressed one. So, appearances may be more important than reality. This relates also to the inability of the administrators to measure learning. They, like all the rest of us, get caught up in styles, symbols, subjectivity. Do you remember long hair

in the 60's and all the hang-ups around that? Everyone with long hair was a wild man and everyone with short hair was a conservative.

Track Record. Developing a track record with clients helps on survival issues. Clients can be encouraged to write flower letters to your vice president. Clients like to do it; they appreciate your help. Short notes or a phone call all help if not overdone. Vice presidents can be encouraged to collect systematic data from clients about your services, and this can help override noise and complaints within the system from the "crazies." Now just a word about the "crazies." There are some people in all organizations and especially universities that "don't like nothin'." I had a grandfather like that, he died at 88 and never met a president that he really liked. Somewhere in all that time, it seems one of them should have gotten lucky. Others will see faculty development activities as "rocking the boat" or "violating the traditions." Unfortunately, most of the individuals who are personally or symbolically offended or scared are not participants in faculty development projects. Nonetheless, they create noise. When they do so directly, we have been able to initiate a discussion or project to ease their concerns.

Just as the survival of faculty development projects is related to institutional political processes, so also are they vulnerable because they are part of the temporary rather than permanent organizational structure of the institution. According to Miles (1964) in his chapter on "Temporary Systems," temporariness fosters energy, flexibility and synergism. This circumstance is ideal for functioning of a program short-term but long-term survival is a more serious issue.

By contrast, departments, faculty specialties (e.g., 17th century literature, clinical psychology) and faculty tenure are institutionalized

by tradition and increasingly by law. It is more routine to replace the department heads and faculty when openings occur--the question asked is "how do you replace X?" Less frequently is the question asked, "Should we shut down this position" or "shut down this department?" Even under the severest of economies, if a good student head count exists, there is a pretty good case for retaining those positions. I mean here the relative stability of positions and units within the organization. Because faculty development is temporary, it tends to be associated with its people rather than its function. Sponsorship at the administrative level is a temporary rather than a stable part of the organization's structure and traditions. Therefore, turnover of leadership of faculty development programs (or of sponsors--e.g., the Vice president) is a signal that survival is at stake and a justification cycle is upcoming. My data base for the above is that we have worked for seven provosts in the last twelve years. While the high turnover may not be typical of other institutions, we have had a lot of experience with it.

When there is a change in faculty development agency leadership, a new justification cycle must be started. For example: In 1971 Warren Bennis came to the University as president; our Director, Campbell Crockett, went to be Dean; there were two co-acting vice presidents. So, all the leadership at the top of the institution was in transition. One of the things that the staff and I dealt with is "What's going to happen to us?" We decided a letter expressing my interest in becoming Director was the straightforward approach. Because of the organization's state of transition, I sent it to all four of them. Their response was that we should justify ourselves. We spent three or four days writing long reports and developing descriptions. And that is when we learned that quarterly

reports were helpful. As a result of that experience, we institutionalized our reporting process for the future.

Simultaneously, the president asked me to be coordinator for long-range planning for the institution. I then went into my negotiation mode. As a result, I was appointed as Director of the agency with the additional role of coordinator for long-range planning for the university. That is how we negotiated our survival and temporarily re-enfranchised the agency.

Three principles about faculty development agency survival relate to the above example. In temporary functions, leadership is personalized, it is that particular leader and his or her power base. Whenever that leader changes the agency's franchise must be reestablished. Secondly, the justification process is reinitiated. It is better if the process is initiated by the agency rather than waiting for the administration. Finally, to re-enfranchise the agency, it may be necessary to redefine its role, to merge with another function or to engage in some combination of these.

A second example of transition for an agency involves a new incumbent in the vice presidential office super-ordinate to it. All vice presidents have different styles, atitudes and priorities. The first thing to be done is to start a process of retraining and socialization with that vice president. Acquainting him/her with what the agency does, checking out the vice president's priorities and adapting to the new style is tiresome, but absolutely essential. This process must be initiated over and over and over every time there is a leadership change. A rather elaborate version of this process occurred in 1973-74 when I was on sabbatical. In the fall of that year we got a new vice president; he raised with me the issues of cutting our funding or eliminating us. What came out of that process, which lasted a year, was the changing of the IRTHE organization to the Faculty Resource

Center. Let me list the elements of that: The name was changed--a symbolic issue related to our local history. This vice president was a faculty man. So calling it "faculty" identified symbolically with faculty. The name was invented in the vice president's office. Thus, he had a stake in invention; hence, he could own it. Also the name change eliminated some of the liabilities of our name which (in the middle 1960's) had acquired connotations of T-Groups, personal growth, etc.--negative associations for the 1970's.

A second part of that process was to get the vice president a data base. One of his assistants sytematically checked with our clients. We had a good track record and the data were favorable. Thus, the vice president had to match the data with what he wanted to do with the budget. A third element was a merger whereby we took over the Media Center. This accomplished two things. It saved the administrative cost for a media director. Additionally it gave the agency some new ways to integrate teaching/learning improvement with media. By having direct administrative control over media, we were able to dictate their budget and how they allocated their time which makes integration of media and instructional development easier.

Also we emerged with a new leader--Tony Grasha became head of the new organization. Some personal and political observations about that shift are of interest at this point. Tony had been rapidly identified with teaching and learning. He had done a lot of workshops in that area. He had helped create the University Educational Council, which is a structure parallel to the Research Council. He was a member of their mini-grants group (advisory group). Overall, he was identified with teaching/learning which is identified with faculty which is identified with the vice president's "faculty man." I was rapidly getting a bad name as a guy "who works with administrators" and who was working on long range planning. By then

everybody had discovered that the University's major problem was underfunding. Thus, our planning process got truncated by budgetary realities. Meanwhile, I was identified with the power structure, the administration, and all the "bad things" that preceed budget cuts and collective bargaining. My personal credibility with this vice president was getting lower. Personally, I was also getting tired--I had been there almost ten years and worked very hard. Tony is a little younger than I am, and he needed some room to grow. Tony and I agreed privately to do a switch. He would become Director and I would become an Associate Director. We figured we could live together in our own agency. What we had to manage was our survival. So part of this whole package of a merger was to get him in that role and to have me step down. We were able to work that out, I think, with marvelous success. Sometimes you need to do a change in leadership because of political credibility issues. Sometimes you need it because you are tired and need a change.

Our survival was helped by our work at the state level. We along with colleagues at other institutions in the state helped the Chancellor's office sponsor some state-wide workshops on teaching and learning. We gained credibility for our association with the Ohio Board of Regents and other faculty development specialists in the state. Our vice president was a political animal; he understood that the Regents pay the money for higher education, that one of the Regents came to the first teaching/learning workshop, and that we were involved in the planning and implementation. One way to help insure survival is also to look at the agency's ties outside of the system. This is because universities still have the mentality that it is wise to go outside to get somebody with good credentials if improvement of a department or college is to be accomplished. Anybody

who is fifty miles away is an expert. If one does faculty development work in one's own system, one can not become an expert locally. However, one can keep good company fifty miles away and they are experts.

One final point about our merger into the Faculty Resource Center. We systematically developed relationships with some of the vice president's assistants. They can sponsor you informally and have access where they can lobby for you if they are so disposed. They can also give you advance warning if you are in trouble.

To summarize, political survival of a faculty development program is fragile. Most of the above actions will help but none is guaranteed. Power confrontations with the administration should be studiously avoided. Only losses will result. Temporary systems are not part of the permanent structure and do not have formal power. Success will come from the application of skill, persuasion, and organizational dexterity. If there is doubt about this, see how ineffective the exercise of direct power is.

The Internal Management of the Faculty Development Agency

The first task in starting an agency or program is identification of goals. Initially these should be modest and easily translated to concrete activities which have high prospects of success (e.g., run a series of six topic-centered workshops for a group of thirty faculty). Typically, a faculty organizing group will want to improve teaching, and this desire translates into a position paper or a grant proposal which can be used to generate funds for staff, secretarial assistance, supplies and conference expense. Before starting or within the first year, it is wise to decide where within faculty development (e.g., professional, instructional, organizational development) energies should be focussed. Ideally, a program

should be functioning in all three areas. As a practical matter, funds are seldom initially available for such an ambitious undertaking. Even if funds were available, it takes one to two years for a staff member to gain the credibility to be sought out by substantial numbers of clients. Moreover, starting in the instructional or professional development areas (or a combination of them) has more face validity in the academy, is most likely to lead to early successes and is least likely to generate negative pressures. Organizational development is the hardest to get started, involves the longest time frame and is politically the most risky.

I believe it takes three to five years to build an agency with a critical mass of three or four professional staff which can offer programs across the entire range of faculty development. My strategy in getting funding has been to start and add pieces. For example, we have requested funds for specific projects, or a number of projects have been combined to justify the addition of a staff member. When starting on a grant, one of the earliest tasks is to identify the part of the grant to be funded out of general funds next year and then which part to be funded the next year and so on. Universities change via incrementalism rather than rapidly. Thus, your strategy must be the same.

The initial internal organization of an agency can be quite informal save for designating someone to lead it. What is important is that each member provide the others with emotional support and an opportunity to share ideas and develop strategies for helping the organization. The style of interaction should be informal and fairly frequent--daily if possible.

With respect to adding staff, I would look for staff with generalist orientations in the teaching/learning area. The individuals picked should be interested in applied approaches, have the interpersonal skills to

build relationships with a variety of individuals and disciplines, and be able to relate in a collaborative manner. Staff who have to be number one are going to cause problems. The agency's clients, those who do the teaching and administration, are the focal group because they are the potential energizers and innovators in their areas. We in faculty development are collaborators helping them where they are. In the technical sense, we frequently know more than our clients. But information has no utility unless it can be used. We live in an imperfect world where change is achieved in a series of approximations. Our task is to help our clients increase their knowledge and skill at applying it. In other words, a professional development orientation should be imbedded in all consultation activities.

I cannot overstress the importance of the type of people hired. The old personnel saying that "those who hire in haste, repent in leisure" is especially true in our work. When persons are hired, a list of specific activities and projects to be performed must be developed. The list is then used in talking with prospective agency employees. Such a concrete approach will provide a way to access candidate style, skills and "fit" in the organization. Remember, the typical program is small and vulnerable as a temporary system. Integrative, not separating forces, are needed. It is a bad strategy, in my opinion, to hire someone who will be the "devil's advocate." Such an orientation will take enormous amounts of staff time and not help that much. Finally, each time a new staff member is hired, explicit attention must be paid as to how to help them gain credibility and thus clients. They will need introductions and several activities that provide visibility to potential clients.

Growth. As a program prospers and grows, some formal ways of organizing must be examined. We divide our activities into program areas: Teaching/learning, career development, academic services (organizational development), graduate intern program (minority affairs) and media services. The idea is to combine similar activities, avoid duplication, coordinate overlapping activities, and give staff more autonomy without producing chaos. A different staff member is in charge of each program area; as the leader, he or she can draw upon any other staff as needed to achieve the goals of that program.

We designed a simple system of doing yearly planning which involved a two-three day workshop with all professional staff. Before the workshop, each program manager developed a long-range plan (2-3 years) for his/her area. Our planning format was PPBS (Program Planning and Budgeting Systems). It requires a goals statement, program plans, and methods of evaluation. At the workshop we shared our plans, modified them and put together a comprehensive plan for the center. This kind of process involves a lot of give and take. At first it is pretty unsophisticated; staff have trouble forecasting and relating to other staff and programs. One way we helped foster integration across the teaching/learning and media programs was to hire a staff member skilled in both. He/she was then physically placed in the media area and became the link between the programs.

Our long-range planning sessions were yearly. We also met quarterly for a day of short-range planning. In the fall each year, we did an orientation for all new staff, and we assigned people to projects. After each quarter, all staff met again to assess the previous quarter and prepare for the next. The program managers were responsible for

leading the discussion of their areas. Also, all senior staff and a representative of the graduate students met weekly in a two-hour staff meeting to provide information flow, coordination and emotional support for the organization.

The choice of type of organization will necessarily depend upon agency heads and their particular institutions. At all times, a strong support system for the staff must be maintained. Caring about each other will keep the operation going. Faculty development is demanding work, and staff need a place to energize themselves. As the agency grows, the organizing task is to improve coordination and planning while maintaining as much staff autonomy as possible.

Strategies for Intervention and Relating to Clients

Where to begin and how to proceed depends upon the institution and its circumstances: size, extent of diversity, mission, economic base, traditions, culture, etc. Needed is entrepreneurship in seeking out opportunities and "hot issues." Initial efforts should be straightforward (e.g., a workshop on...), short-term (3 months), concrete and visible, with good chances for early success. If initial activities are not easily assessed or apparent, surveys or interviews of departments on their needs for training graduate students is one place to begin. Similarly, we have contacted groups of faculty to determine their knowledge or skill needs. With this information monographs or workshops can be designed to fill stated needs. Participants at short workshops then see the responsiveness of the faculty development unit and can begin to articulate additional needs, talk about the unit to colleagues, and suggest more ambitious undertakings to their chairpersons (e.g., redesign of a course or a curriculum).

Another strategy is to introduce the agency's activities to various faculty and administrators and then to ask for suggestions on next steps. Administrators often have good ideas, may seek help now or later, or will make reference to someone else needing assistance. Even though we have been established for several years, we repeat the above processes periodically. We systematically introduce ourselves to newly appointed deans and department heads. New faculty and graduate students are exposed to our work via our participation in their fall orientation programs.

Overall, we view our consultation process as building a relationship, doing a needs diagnosis, exploring alternative approaches, choosing an action plan, implementing it, and performing an evaluation. This basic action research process is repeated over and over again varying only in scope and time frame depending on the problem under consideration. All of this is done with volunteer clients who seek our assistance. We operate collaborately with the client to help that individual be more effective. Our orientation is formative rather than summative, a distinction Scrivan (1972) makes with respect to the goals of evaluation. We are working for the client, not someone else.

Because we are working for the client, whose participation is voluntary, the relationship is confidential. Data belong to the client. Any reports to higher administration have to be approved by the client. While information handling could be a problem, we have had few troubles. Adminstrators have not pressed to know. Nonetheless, how the data will be used is always a concern of clients, and ground rules must be clarified at the outset. Suggesting clients talk to earlier clients can be one way to allay fears.

Much of our early learning was trial and error. Any newly-formed

unit will also find itself using this method because not enough is yet known about faculty development. What we have been trying to do in recent years is identify development strategies which lead to cumulative benefits and permit changes in policies or practices that reward effective innovation. For example, it is one thing to help a faculty member improve his/her teaching and another to have a reward system that encourages it. While a great number of faculty will experiment with their teaching because of the intrinsic challenge, being recognized helps. Several years ago, we helped write the reappoint/promotion review policy to incorporate a systematic review of teaching. Our institution, as others, is still struggling with the problems of measurement. But, having official recognition of good teaching helps our work with individual faculty.

Briefly, I want to describe a typology of development strategies Tony Grasha and I prepared for another paper (Boyer and Grasha, 1977). Five strategies are involved. Strategy I, Resource Materials and Strategy II, Informational Workshops and Training, are designed to improve individual faculty/administrator knowledge and skills. These strategies are the easiest and least expensive to initiate. Typically, in training programs, transfer of knowledge or training to the participant's organization is their task and hinges on their commitment to experimentation.

Strategy III, Crisis, is just what it appears to be, short-term assistance to an adminstrator, faculty member or their unit. Strategy IV, Short-Term Consultation: Development and Strategy V, Long-Term Consultation: Development are developmental activities designed to facilitate initiation, implementation, and incorporation of some positive change in an organizational unit as well as in an individual's skills. A curriculum, a promotion process, or a unit's method of using graduate assistants could be potential

development targets.

Over the long-term we seek to convert activities which begin with individuals, Strategies I and II, into broader development activities with a unit (Strategies IV and V). For example, we pilot-tested an all-day faculty evaluation/development workshop with twelve deans in Spring of 1973 (Strategy II). Our objectives were to do some individual development and to try out some new technology. Subsequently, the Dean of Nursing asked us to design a followup with her entire college staff (Strategy IV), which increased the likelihood of implementation and incorporation of new processes in an actual organizational setting. Now for a short description of each strategy.

I. Resource Materials. This strategy is designed to acquaint faculty and administrators with new ideas, to nudge them into new directions, and to anticipate recurrent informational needs or dilemmas. For example, we developed a monograph series on issues related to teaching and administration. We discovered that most adminstrators and faculty do not have the interest or the time to delve deeply into the technical or professional literature of higher education. However, they are or can be interested in ideas/techniques that have rather immediate applicability for them. Thus, we used our expertise to comb the literature, distill it, and prepare monographs. These monographs are "cookbooks" with a small number of general concepts, several techniques, and some example forms (e.g., sample development plans, evaluation forms). We pass them out free of charge on campus.

Resource materials, especially monographs, help leverage one's efforts on development in two ways. First, we use our expertise to translate materials that clients can use without direct consultation with us. Secondly, we save a lot of our staff time which was formerly spent in individual

consultations on recurring topics. How a secretary responds to some (not all) initial requests with a monograph, a cup of coffee and a comfortable chair in our library. Many times the monographs and/or the secretary can fill the client's needs. If not, our staff member can start with the client at a more advanced level. Preparation and distribution of resource materials can be initiated with a minimum of organizational sanction and a modest budget.

II. Informational Training Workshops. This strategy is designed to provide information and training for individual faculty and administrators. It can be employed around a variety of informational areas like new organizational policies and practices, and skill development on topics such as effective lecturing, Keller plan, group discussions, self-assessment, and developing goals. Our workshops have tended to be short: two hours to half day in duration. Longer workshops are typically parts of development Strategies IV and V. Longer week-long programs for department chairpeople who have been in the role awhile and one- or two-day programs to orient new chairpeople are also possibilities. We have had limited experience with these approaches, but other institutions have tried such workshops successfully. Primarily we have run short workshops to share relatively specific ideas and techniques of immediate usefulness to faculty and administrators. Also, we have seen them as a way to develop and try some new technology, gain visibility for our staff, and as entry to client systems leading to Strategies IV and V. When workshops are offered by a staff organization without some specific organizational sanction, participation is totally voluntary, and can be limited by other pressures and schedule conflicts. Last fall we offered a workshop for chairpersons by two experienced chairpersons on Helping Faculty Develop Performance Goals. The workshop was

first offered generally to all chairpersons. Out of a possible population of 150, twenty-two signed up and about a dozen actually came. For those in attendance, the dialogue was lively and evaluated as positive by them. By contrast,the same workshop was conducted for a dean and his chairpeople, all of whom attended. This dean actively supported the workshop and strongly encouraged attendance. At several subsequent monthly chairperson meetings, the implications of the workshop for their departments were discussed.

Besides the sanction issue, there are expertise and budget concerns. Workshops run by the institution for its own staff tend to be less expensive and can be tailored to its needs. However, trained staff may not be available. If an institution is just getting started or lacks full-time resources, one alternative is paid consultants from other institutions for an institution or via a consortium arrangement. However, the use of consultants should be tied to training your staff as well as the immediate benefit of a particular workshop.

III. Short-Term Consultation: Crisis. This is a reactionary rather than a planned strategy. Actually we wish there were fewer crises. Individuals call upon us with emergencies and ask us to be "firemen": they call late to get last minute assistance in a workshop that looks poorly planned but routine and turns out to be a crisis; they call for help in improvement of a unit but underestimate the conflict; or they know there is a mess and hope we can perform some type of "magic."

Refusing to help on a crisis hurts a consultant's credibility, but they generally are not fun and can hurt credibility anyway by association. Such crises typically arise from breakdown in communication or decision-making or as in Cohen and March's language from a history of "flight"

and "oversight" rather than resolution of problems.

Being invited to help on a "crisis" is a tribute to one's credibility and hard work on other prior endeavors. Unless one has a "track" record of trustworthy-helpfulness, one is not asked. Participation is hard on the stomach and requires a comfort with risk, conflict, chaos, and minimal control over the events of the crisis.

Crisis consultation happens; it is not planned. It can help alleviate immediate problems, primarily the symptoms, or can help an administrator select a reasonable choice among several negative ones. Unfortunately, the client systems so effected do not usually follow the crisis with preventative measures. We do, however, make it a practice of staying in contact with a client following a crisis. This requires one to be "pushy" and only occasionally leads to follow-up. It seems "crises" and "crises consultants" are best if "kept at a distance."

IV. Short-Term Consultation: Development. This strategy is intended to impact both the leadership behavior and the funccioning of the unit in some specific areas (such as effectiveness of meetings, departmental planning at the start of an academic year, the review of a teacher evaluation questionnaire, functioning of a particular committee or task force, etc.). The client is the leader of the unit and some or all members of the unit. The setting is the ongoing functioning of the unit. The time frame is short (1-6 weeks) and the issues to be addressed are limited rather than comprehensive.

One example of this strategy involved helping a unit prepare for a new academic year. A typical approach would involve individual interviews with faculty and the chairperson to identify issues and concerns. These data are summarized, shared with participants and utilized to design

a workshop agenda. Next, a one- or two-day planning retreat is held where we serve as process consultants to facilitate dialogue and planning. At the workshop, the unit members typically clarify goals and objectives for the year and agree on steps to be taken for their achievement. We might or might not be involved in the subsequent implementation steps.

In other cases, task forces to redesign curriculum, to supervise student selection, to redesign by-laws, etc., may be created. From our point of view we request either a verbal or questionnaire evaluation of the consultation. This helps us become more skillful and helps identify follow-up activity needs if any. A lot of consultations stop here with either no need for follow-up by the consultant or the management of this process is assumed by the unit. Typically, the particular task identified has been completed.

In our situation we are staff for the total institution with a portion of our time available to members of other units for purposes of consultation. The time is free to clients. An institution may choose to establish such a staff arrangement. However, one or two years will be needed for staff to be utilized effectively. This is because development of a leader and unit within the context of their regular function is a more risky proposition for the client(s) than participating in the more traditional modes of learning illustrated in Strategies I and II. Clients can be reluctant to air their "dirty linen" and afraid a mistake or awkward learning attempt will jeopardize theirs or the organization's future.

A consultant's reputation and skill can be developed over a period of time via successful performance in Strategies I and II. Then by word of mouth, one develops a track record and some initial relationships in a given system. This does not alter the risk a client may feel, but may make them more willing to take risks.

V. Long-Term Consultation: Development. This strategy like Strategy IV intends to impact both the leadership behavior and the functioning of the organizational unit. Rather than focus on one particular task or activity the intent is comprehensive development of a unit over a longer time frame (e.g., 3 months - 3 years). The clients are the leaders of the unit and some or all members of the unit. The setting is the ongoing functioning of the unit. Primarily our long-term consultation has been with academic units to improve departmental effectiveness. Since 1969 we have worked with such units as Architecture, Urban Design, Philosophy, Nursing and Health, Interior Design, Economics, Educational Administration, Behavioral Sciences, Community Planning.

We assume that departments give the least attention to "adaptive activities" such as organizational planning, environmental analysis, innovation and experimentation (Peterson, 1970). Further, we assume: (1) departments (contrary to popular academic myths) are not autonomous and need to concern themselves with issues beyond their immediate domain, (2) department performance is related to internal organization, and (3) the nature of the leadership has consequences for performance (Peterson, 1970). Our concern has been to help departments improve their capabilities to develop educational plans, including examination of resource allocation; improve teaching effectiveness; improve faculty and student relationships; develop more effective promotion and tenure processes; and improve their ability to relate effectively to the rest of the institution (Bolton & Boyer, 1973).

The duration of the consultations has varied from three months to three years depending on the number and kinds of follow-up. In one department, a redesign of the undergraduate curriculum took three years

to conceive and implement. Some of the faculty have published an article on the new curriculum. A second department wanted more information about their program, so they surveyed past graduates and employers, a process lasting about six months and resulting in some refinements to their offerings. In a third department the process came to a halt after two planning retreats when it became apparent that the leadership was unwilling/unable to make the changes needed to deal with some of the issues raised in the initial self-study. Subsequently, this chairperson resigned. On balance, significant positive results are achieved in about eighty (80) percent of the consultations as judged by departmental members and by us in our consulting role. Almost always chairpersons feel more enlightened and self-confident and report more effective job performance. Further description of this process is found in Bolton and Boyer (1973).

All the preconditions needed for Strategy IV hold true for Strategy V (Long-Term Consultation): (1) staff time for the consutlation, (2) confidential treatment of client information, (3) consultant track record with other clients, (4) ability to build problem-solving relationships, and (5) ability to relate to a variety of differing client styles.

Also, it is necessary for the consultant to understand the institutional context surrounding the client system. For example, it was important to know that faculty in a client community college were actively involved in the collective bargaining process at the institutional level. Collective bargaining is political--about power and influence--thus limiting, at least, short-term, the possibilities for a collaborative approach. In the case of work with departments, we have been more active with departments which have a professional or applications focus. These departments have external conditions (e.g., accreditation, licensing

boards) and disciplinary value systems which seem to make them favorably disposed to pursue collaborative efforts at self-renewal.

This has been a brief discussion of developmental strategies. For a more detailed view, see Bolton and Boyer, 1973; Boyer and Grasha, 1977. Taking the general theme of development, the task is to build on early efforts so that later efforts have more breath and impact in an institution. Another task is to share with all of us what is learned.

Conclusion

Faculty development is an emerging activity. It has its problems. Among them is faddishness. Nonetheless, it is exciting and fun, and we are learning more each day. As Robert Merton said, "The way to see how an organization works is to try to change it." I have discussed the organizational problems of starting and maintaining a program. Essentially, I have suggested that a program needs to be entrepreneurial, competitive, and dexterous in dealing with the matters of sponsorship and legitimization. Survival is a political problem over and above being competent. Management of the program itself requires collaboration and supportiveness. Faculty development is very demanding of individuals. One of the best ways to renew oneself is tend to the care and feeding of others. Do not brood about failures; learn from them, and enjoy successes.

With respect to clients. An agency has to be entrepreneurial in seeking them but collaborative in serving them. A lot can be learned from clients. The process should be made a mutual one.

In any effort the best approach is to do the best job possible and to try to grow in the process. Try not to get "hooked" into changing the entire institution. Be vigilant about the agency's survival, but do not get overly preoccupied, or no fun will result, nor will any interesting

projects evolve. Be willing to change, modify, and adapt--that is what clients are asked to do. In the long-term, one should not take oneself too seriously. As Edison once said "Innovation is one percent inspiration and 99 percent perspiration." If work becomes too onerous--get out--there are always other things one can do.

Chapter V

Developmental Theories of Learning

Roger A. Myers

Twice each year I have gone to the Law School at Columbia to tell seminar participants what we know of learning theory that will help them train lawyers. It takes me five minutes to get through that, and then we talk about what they are really concerned about. When I was a graduate student at Ohio State, a favorite professor whose name was Horace English, said, "Learning theory is the psychology of rats and college freshmen, treated as if they were rats." I noticed at Ohio State, studying under some very good psychologists, that while they were teaching learning theory, they never used any of it. Which reminds me of a story: A famous professor, since gone from Columbia, had a good friend who was one of the world's foremost experts in decision theory. His friend came to him and said, "John, I'm troubled. I've got a very good offer from a prestigious West Coast university; it will mean more pay; there will be less fixed responsibility. The housing will be much more pleasant; there's all that sunshine. But I'm in conflict, because I love New York and its cultural richness. My wife is pleasantly, happily employed here. What do you think I ought to do?" John said, "But my friend! You're an expert on decision theory. You know what to do. Lay out the options, assign the utilities, figure the probabilities, and do it." The friend said, "Oh, come on John, quit kidding! This is serious."

And so it is with learning theory. It has not indeed delivered on its promise or on the promise attributed to it, as a style or as a set of resources for guiding the educational enterprise. Most persons concerned

with faculty development have already dipped into theories of learning, and have tried to figure what is there that could help you do what you need to do. Twenty-eight years ago Goodwin Watson wrote, "What psychology can we feel sure about" (Watson, 1960). A very short article! It was widely read because he did analyze what psychology knew that educators could use. But it was a very short article, including about 12 essential items. If that article were to be rewritten today by Watson or by anyone else, there would probably be 13.

It is not an area of intellectual activity that has led to great gains on the part of educators. And so, rather than discussing learning theory, I would like to consider developmental theory. I do so with some misgivings, because as I review the contents of this book, I see that nearly everything is called "developmental," and I find it is used in at least three different ways--e.g., the design of materials or equipment; raising money; or growth and change.

What I mean when I say "development" is that growth and change part. One useful definition of development suggests "qualitative changes which take place which contribute to an individual's increasingly complex manner of interpreting his or her world, allowing him or her to integrate and act on a wide variety of differentiated experiences and influences." It will not come as a surprise to know that people who think in developmental terms think about sequences and hierarchies, and think about characteristic changes and complexity when they think about development.

How does one promote development? There are two main points of view. One point of view, which is not so much in favor today as it was in the past, is that the forces of development and change are resident in the individual. All one need do is provide sufficient support and surround, and development

and change will take place. A more prevalent and more popular view of how one participates in development and change is that it requires a balance of challenge on the one hand and support on the other. Since most schemes of development include successive periods of integration--when one achieves a style of dealing with his environment--and disintegration--when that style no longer works, begins to break down, results in tension, so that other integrations can take place.

It was Otto Rank (one of the early fathers of psychotherapy, as we know today) who characterized this pattern of challenge and support and focused on the importance of timing, so that support can be available when it's needed, and removed at the appropriate time so that challenge can take its place, followed by more support, and so on (Rank, 1945).

Those two simple themes about hierarchical and sequential development and the promotion of development through challenge and support are what I want to discuss in this chapter. One more concept is needed, and that is the importance of individual differences in the learner. If one is going to deal in successive applications of challenges, it is important to know who the learner is, where he or she is now, what kinds of influence are required, or what kinds of influence are best at this point. In order to recognize individual differences when they hit you in the face, it is important to have some kind of model, some kind of theoretical frame, some way of knowing what is going to happen at some point in time.

I have been intrigued, in recent years, with the way that theories of development of college-age people, have taken the place of theories of learning in helping educators structure what they do. That is, while theories of learning never provided an adequate base for designing educational environments, it begins to look as if there is some hope that

theories of adult development, especially in the college years, will. I'm speaking of the work of many people probably quite familiar: Douglas Heath (1965, 1968) perhaps the most eloquent of the theorists; Arthur Chickering (1969); William Perry (1970); Harvey, Hunt and Schroder (1961); and many others. There has emerged, in the last two years, a series of studies in which educational environments were structured according to the insights provided by these theorists. These studies, in varying ways of structuring educational environments based on theories of development, have begun with student personnel workers.

I want to talk to you today about two cases to illustrate how this is done, how it's going on, what we can look forward to seeing in the near future. In order to do that I will limit my gaze to the theoretical work of just one developmental theorist, William Perry. For many years Perry has been the director of something titled "Bureau of Study Counsel," which is, after all, a counseling center. Bill Perry has worked skillfully, diligently, tirelessly to understand what's going on in this typical group of normal American youth, Harvard undergraduates. He wrote in 1970 a very good book called Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. In the book, he characterized al[illegible] insights from some 30 years of work with Harvard youths, and from some 12 years of carefully conducted and thoroughly thought-out research. Perry has a scheme. It is a relatively simple scheme. He blushes when one calls it a theory. It is a three-dimensional scheme which consists almost totally of a rich understanding of cognitive complexity, and how it changes from time to time.

It has essentially three stages: the stages are called "dualism," which is the lowest, most despicable stage; "multiplicity," which is not such a good stage either, but it is getting better; and "commitment within

relativism," which is the highest of all stages. Each stage has three points in it, and what follows gives a flavor of each.

In dualism, the first three positions represent a dualistic structure for viewing knowledge in balance. The dualistic learner assumes that all information can be classified as either right or wrong, and that uncertainty is an error of some sort. For the student in these positions, learning is a matter of finding and knowing right answers. In moving from position one, which is the lowest, to position three, which is the highest position within dualism, the student successfully alters his explanation for uncertainty, increasing his acceptance of its legitimacy.

In relativism, in the movement through positions four, five and six, absolute right and wrong conceptions of knowledge and values are displaced. In position four, multiplicity, the student perceives uncertainty to be legitimate and pervasive, yet it exists in an unordered diversity. In position five, all knowledge is seen as contextual and relativistic. At this point, concern with the nature of knowledge interacts with the student's personal life. The student seems to generalize relativistic assumptions to the realm of self and is faced with many vantage points from which to consider his own identity. At stage six, the highest level of multiplicity, the individual seems to recognize that his identity will be created by acts of commitment.

Finally, there is commitment within relativism. In contrast to the earlier positions, the changes defined in the last three positions are affective rather than structural. Movement through these positions involves the individual's recognition that affirmation of identity in commitment is a process which will demand continual attention.

As I said, it is a matter of cognitive complexity by and large, and

yet there's more to it. Some very intelligent people had decided that if this theory did correspond to the realities as Perry saw them, it was clear that it was better to exist in the state of commitment than in the state of dualism. It was also likely that certain kinds of educational applications would work better with certain people than with others. Perhaps in the absence of other dimensions, understanding where one stood on this scheme from dualism to multiplicity to commitment might help, as a theoretical frame, to design educational experiences.

I have two cases, both based on Perry's scheme, to report to you, some in detail, some in not such detail, mostly to illustrate what has been going on in this realm. The first is the work of L. Lee Knefelkamp and Ron Slepitza, at the University of Maryland. They decided that they would like to stamp out dualism to the extent that they could and to the extent that they found it in their students. They had control of a course, a credit course, in career development. It was a substantive course, but it was one of those "semi-guts" in which people were to learn about the process of career development and presumably do something about their own. Their goals were to teach the content, to help the students relate what they learned to their lives outside the classroom, and to expand the complexity of the thinking of their students. These were not terribly idiosyncratic educational goals, it seems to me.

They went to work on the process of bringing about change in dualistic or multiplistic thinkers. True to Otto Rank, interpreted by Nevitt Sanford (1967) they believe that challenge and support must be used alternately. Their own creation was to decide that in order to create sufficient challenge the learning experience must have within it considerable diversity; more diversity than one usually thinks about in putting together a class.

Most of us who teach or structure learning experiences are likely to fall into the habit of what B.F. Skinner calls the fallacy of the good student, the habit of designing our experiences as if everybody in it were a maximally efficient or effective learner. To use Perry's notions, we would probably structure our learning experiences for people in the stage of commitment, or at least in a high stage of multiplicity. Not so with Knefelkamp and Slepitza. They decided that in order to create challenge among dualists at least, one needed high diversity. Secondly, one needed experiential learning. After all, if dualist thinkers were not inclined to regard knowledge as part of themselves, saw it rather as something peripheral to them to be acquired, accepted or rejected, then experiential learning would provide a challenge to that point of view. So much for challenge.

The support, they said, must be created with high structure. That is, though there was going to be a great deal of diversity in the learning experience, and thugh there was going to be a lot of experiential learning, there had to be considerabe structure about what was going to go on. There must be no ambiguity about wht was to come next. There was going to be no ambiguity about what the total package was to include. And so, they structured their experiences with a great deal of specificity. And finally, they argued that the learning experience should be a highly personal atmosphere.

Each class experience was arranged with high diversity, a great deal of experiential learning, a lot of structure, and a very personal atmosphere. They went through the usual things people go through in career courses, except that they did them with particular fidelity to these four principles. Most important of all, they created (actually they did not

create, they adapted) a system of student logs, so that, even though the class was carried on in a group, there was a continuous and intense individual conversation going on between the student and the professor through the medium of the student log. In the student log, the student would respond to what he or she saw happening in class each day, would respond to specific assignments, and so on.

Every night the poor professor would sit and annotate the logs, and communicate directly to the student those things that were not either possible or wise to communicate in class. So much for the method; let me reveal another startling thing about the investigators. While instituting an innvoation based on a developmental theory, they did an outrageous thing. They studied the consequences of what they did. They even were so cold-hearted as to withhold their benevolence from certain people who wanted it, hence creating a control group.

What did they find? 87% of the people in their group moved from the lower position of dualism to a higher position, most often multiplicity, but in some cases, commitment. Sixty-three percent of those people moved a highly significant amount. The content was learned in the same way and in the same degree as it was in the control group. But the other changes took place. The changed they were after--the attempt to increase the cognitive complexity and hence the developmental status of their students--was achieved.

Case Two: two very able investigators, Carole Widick and Deborah Simpson, working at Ohio State University quite recently, also used Perry as a theoretical basis for designing learning systems. Perry has some relatively clearcut things to say about individual differences, and I will share at least Widick and Simpson's view of them now.

In the dualist, the encounters with uncertainty or diversity are often very stressful. One can assume that an open classroom would not be a very happy place for students who are dualistic. Interpretive tasks, such as essays, pose grave difficulties. It is quite hard to compare or contrast an issue when one does not recognize that a variety of legitimate viewpoints exists. Learning occurs at the direction of the instructor, the authority who has the "right answer." Independent approaches to a course are the decided exception. Evaluation may take on an overwhelming importance. Students may be confused about the criteria for getting grades; they may pay excessive attention to procedural details, such as numbers of pages and so on.

On the other hand, in the early stages of relativism, some students turn the idea of pluralism into academic license, emphasizing the value of intuition. Relativistically-thinking students appear to manage their studies more efficiently and more effectively. In particular, they are capable of performing complex analytic tasks with some skill. To these students learning has become more internalized; they seem more able to use the freedom to learn. In general, these students express less concern about pleasing their teacher and about the evaluation procedures.

Once again, Widick and Simpson used this knowledge of individual differences to design their course. This time, no Mickey Mouse career development course; this time freshman history. They managed to get their hands on a course at Ohio State which included large lecture and several independent discussion sections. They did a variety of things, but once again they varied for the dualistic students organized together in a special discussion section the diversity of enterprise, the experiential learning modes, the high degree of structure, and the personal atmosphere.

I could give you more details about what Widick and Simpson did; there is, however, less time that I thought there would be. Let me just suggest that they did a particularly creative job of designing these learning experiences in the history course, without obstructing what the instructor wanted to do, simply by taking the role of the graduate assistant in a couple of special sections arranged at their convenience. They, too, did research. They, too, compared their results with those of a control group. They, too, found robust results in the degree of cognitive complexity their particular teaching style brought about.

There are other cases. I have a casebook (Parker, 1978) full of ways in which James Hurst at Colorado Sate University has used Arthur Chickering's vectors for a way of styling particular learning experiences within the counseling center and elsewhere on the campus. And so it is with Douglas Heath at Haverford.

What I am saying, I suppose, is clear: Do not look to learning theories to tell you how to design educational experiences for people over whom you have some sway. The wave of the future is in these theories of development. Now, they are not the best theories as theories go. They do not meet the criteria of comprehensiveness; they do not meet the criteria of logical consistency in all cases; but they do meet the criteria of generativity. They are useful. People can take them, decide what it is they should prescribe for the learner in any learning environment, and design the learning experience accordingly.

Chapter VI

The Developmental Stages of the Faculty Improvement Field

Gary H. Quehl

Successful, innovative faculty development practices must be placed within a perspective to be most helpful, for there are very real problems in talking about successful innovations in faculty development practices. The first problem is that so much of what can be said about successful innovations is highly impressionistic; the field is so new that we simply do not yet possess the kind of systematic knowledge to make more than very general judgments about what is sucessful and what is not. The second problem is that nothing I say today should be confused with the real thing. Most, if not all, of us whose papers appear in this book are screening our judgments through the experience of others. That is, we are at best chroniclers of events because we are second and third persons removed from those who are actually doing and experiencing faculty development. I can comfortably say this about myself even though I have created and managed and evaluated three faculty development programs.

The third problem in talking about innovative faculty development practices is that there's no such thing as "innovation" in the abstract. What is my innovation may be your old hat; what may be exciting, and new, and useful to me in working with faculty in their improvement may be ancient history to you or not even relevant. However, you would not want to deny that my successes may be innovative to me, and my colleagues, in our setting. Used in this way, the term, "innovation," has a highly existential meaning. Of course, there is another way of looking at the term. This is when the theory and practice in a field become regarded by

its practitioners to be "innovative" because other theory and practice have become obsolete.

To understand this meaning of the term, I wish to borrow Thomas S. Kuhn's concept of the paradigm, which was advanced in his study, The Structure of the Scientific Resolutions (1970). In describing Kuhn's work, David Halliburton of Stanford University suggests that speaking of a paradigm is to point to a nexus of shared assumptions on which the activity in any field is carried out. A paradigm furnishes patterns both for research and practice, even though this pattern may be taken for granted. It determines not only how one goes about studying and behaving; it also determines what one studies and practices by defining what questions are to be asked and the mode in which they are to be answered and implemented. Paradigms underlie not only the various academic disciplines but higher education itself (Chickering et al., 1977, p. 35). I would add that paradigms also underlie the rapidly growing field of modern faculty development.

Paradigms have dynamic rather than static qualities. Although most changes in a field seem to be incremental, we occasionally observe a major paradigm shift because there is a fundmental change in the assumptions that provide a basis for thought and action, as well as a fundamental change in that thought and action. As an example of a major paradigm shift Halliburton offers the transition from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican perspective of the relation of the earth to the universe: "Each astronomer saw 'reality' but from the perspective of different assumptions--in short, different paradigms (Chickering et al., 1977, p. 38).

It is my thesis that paradigms have shifted in the faculty development field, not once but several times, and that such shifts will continue to occur as long as this new field is valued within the academic community. When talking about innovations in faculty development, then, I am arguing that we look for our examples primarily within the meaning of a given paradigm. Toward the end of my paper, I will briefly refer to some of the things that point to the emergence of a new paradigm, as well as a few of the innovations that may be leading the way.

I have chosen to call this chapter The Developmental Stages of the Faculty Improvment Field, but what I am actually going to do is to present three different paradigms that give meaning to the term "innovation."

Paradigm I: Leaving the Faculty Alone (the not-too-distant past)

The first paradigm is generally considered to be obsolete by most practitioners in the field. While this paradigm probably continues to be valued in major research universities, it largely belongs more to the not-too-distant past when environmental conditions were different. Our colleges were fiscally sound. We selected students on the basis of proven promise rather than admitting them because we needed to fill a freshman class. Competition for faculty was fierce; they had their choice of several positions, and the good ones tended to move from college to college whenever a better possibility presented itself. Loyalty was to the profession rather than to the college or its special mission.

It was assumed that the college was primarily a community of scholars, and its principal responsibility was to provide the resources and climate which promoted teaching and scholarly excellence in the individual disci-

plines. Students were assumed to be privileged to learn what faculty members wanted to teach, and what mattered most to faculty was that their best students were accepted into distinguished graduate programs.

I label this paradigm, Leaving the Faculty Alone, because it was believed that faculty were already pretty much developed. Having passed through the rigors of Ph.D. training, it was assumed that any faculty member was fully capable of providing for his or her own continuing development as a teacher and scholar. And, like General Motors, what the individual faculty member considered to be best for his or her own development was clearly assumed to be best for the college and its students.

What were then regarded as "innovative" faculty development programs essentially fell into three kinds of activities. New faculty members were provided an orientation program that introduced them to the mores of the college and, particularly, to how the "system" of moving through the ranks operated. Second, it was more or less assumed that faculty members who needed or wanted refreshment could depend on a sabbatical leave every six years or so; it was not important that the purpose of the leave have any direct bearing on the local curriculum, students, or college. Third, the budding scholar could obtain a small research grant from institutional funds, and the established scholar usually had access to foundation and government grants for special research projects.

And what, you may ask, about innovations in the evaluation of faculty performance? Certainly, evaluation was undertaken because there was no way of avoiding decisions about tenure and promotion, but innovative practices were largely absent. Evaluation primarily consisted of an informal process by which senior members of the faculty made judgments about junior members'

teaching on the basis of the grapevine, and about scholarly performance through the number of publications produced. Little thought was given to using evaluation as a way of identifying areas that needed improvement, and little help existed even if the faculty member wanted to improve.

Paradigm II: The Proliferation of Faculty Development Practices (the present)

If the not-too-distant past was essentially characterized by a hands-off approach to assisting faculty in their continuing professional development, the current paradigm is best characterized by a growing body of theory on the subject and the promotion of a large array of faculty development methods and practices, particularly in the area of instruction. This new paradigm has helped heighten awareness of the need for faculty development in our colleges and universities and has pointed to the inadequacies of the first paradigm. It has also given rise to faculty development as a legitimate field of study and practice.

The underlying circumstances that produced a shift from the former to the current paradigm are well known to all of us. New environmental realities, including steady-state economic conditions and a decreasing population of traditional college-age students, produced a serious decline in faculty turnover and mobility even in our most distinguished colleges and universities. It was not long before we realized that the majority of faculty were to be with their colleges for their whole career, and that personnel decisions made early in careers would have a dramatic impact on our colleges for years to come. This meant that more systematic and objective ways of evaluating faculty performance had to be established.

Another reason for a paradigm shift was that we found our pronouncements about the existence of teaching excellence had to be matched by

performance. The rise of the student-consumer movement helped change our minds about who the colleges existed for. We found that students no longer had difficulty getting into college and that they would not stay enrolled in our college if what they found did not match our promise or their expectations. The disintegration of the core curriculum and the re-emergence of the free elective system did more than allow students to enroll in courses of their own interest and choosing; it showed us that bad teaching often had been protected by curriculum requirements. Once this was discovered, we became sensitive to the fact that faculty members want to perform well and that they hurt a bit when they do not, or simply can not, improve--either because it used to be considered unprofessional to ask for help or because no help existed.

There was also a third reason for our being pulled to the second paradigm. Our nexus of assumptions about faculty development simply did not jibe with our knowledge that a college--even a small college--is a complex social system, and that the need to improve instruction and scholarship is but part of a larger need to improve performance throughout the whole institution. Many of our earlier attempts to improve instruction, for example, were thwarted by organizational obstacles that arose in such offices as business or registrar; we also learned that curricular innovations usually failed to produce desired effects unless a high degree of compatibility existed between program goals and the personal goals and values of faculty members. All of this pointed to the need for a new theory that would incorporate personal, instructional, and organizational development as interdependent needs and activities. To ignore any one of these components in designing a faculty development program could invite unsatisfactory results, if not disaster.

Such a theory has been developed and promulgated through various publications and faculty development experiments over the past six years. Unfortunately, the basic leadership for this instrumental contribution to the field has been largely ignored or misunderstood by those who would serve as chroniclers of the past. Lest these key personalities be forgotten now that faculty development is a respectable field of inquiry, allow me to say that William Bergquist, Jack Noonan, Walter Sykes, and Steven Phillips were among the most important pioneers of modern faculty development. Whether "successful" innovations have resulted from their basic theory and practice over the past six years is a matter of conjecture, although I personally believe this has been the case.

David Justice has more to say on this matter in the following paper, but I would like to point to five examples that stand out in my mind. First, there are the week-long intensive faculty development workshops that were first designed and used by the College Center of the Finger Lakes in 1972 to introduce faculty to personal, instructional, and organizational improvement through an experiental teaching/learning methodology. The reason these early workshops are important is not that they are now being re-produced with similar success by many organizations across the country; it is because most of our theory about personal, instructional, and organizational development was created and tested in that setting. Second, I believe that Steven Phillips' work on the personal development of faculty at the University of Puget Sound and other local colleges is one of the most successful efforts of its kind. Third, in the area of improving curriculum by combining it with what we know about faculty development, I would point to a month-long experimental college that the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) is sponsoring this

summer (1978) at Bowdoin College in Brunswick, Maine. Fourth, Kent Alm, Director of the Resource Center for Planned Change of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, is producing important new knowledge for the field by assisting more than 200 institutions to plan for their future, from the future. This "futures invention" approach to organizational development is innovative not only because it enables whole institutions to learn how to plan in new ways that are highly participatory, but because it shows them how to incorporate program evaluation, programs for new clientele, and faculty and staff development within this organzational development framework. Finally, I would be amiss if I did not mention the IDEA system* at the Kansas State University and the TABS system** at the University of Massachusetts as the outstanding examples of innovation in faculty evaluation; each has had a significant national impact on colleges and universities.

Before leaving the current paradigm, let me turn briefly to the strategies that are being used to introduce and sustain faculty development initiatives. These are important because many of the significant innovations that produced the current paradigm have more to do with strategies for introducing and sustaining faculty development programs than with practices that have resulted. These three strategies are also important because they express something about the urgency of our needs and the often thoughtless way in which we have rushed to adopt a plethora of methods and practices as a new panacea for resolving our problems. Essentially what I am saying is that we have turned to a small group of

---

*Instructional Development Effectiveness Assessment (IDEA) system.

**Teaching Analysis by Students (TABS) system.

experts outside our colleges for models and practices rather than developing our own. I believe this is one of the most salient features of the current paradigm.

In the first strategy, a college either hires a research and development firm to create a faculty improvement program from scratch or it adopts a successful model from another college. In either case, the program is simply plugged into the client college. The strength of this strategy is that the program may be theoretically well-grounded and look excellent on paper or in practice elsewhere. The weakness is that it is somebody else's solution rather than a program that is developed out of the college's own needs, experience, and resources.

A far more common strategy has been the practice of having one or more national experts consult with colleges on establishing a faculty development program. The strength of this second strategy is that the careful selection of expertise can bring very special skills to a campus when and where they are needed; it can also give credibility to the need for faculty development and help to initiate widespread interest in it. The weakness is that the external consultant may not allow this assistance to grow from the felt needs of a college but, rather, from what he or she thinks is best for the institution. Also, there has been a tendency for colleges to create an unhealthy dependency on unusually successful external consultants; knowing when to terminate such a relationship has often been difficult for all parties involved.

While the first two strategies have been used sucessfully, and innovations have resulted, more and more colleges that have initial planning experience behind them are finding that the best way of establishing and sustaining a faculty development program is to provide training to indi-

viduals and small groups of their own faculty. Some of the most innovative training has been done off-campus in a neutral and supportive setting and often has involved faculty from other nearby colleges. Successful examples are to be found in such consortial arrangements as the Great Lakes Colleges Association, the College Center of the Finger Lakes, and the Kansas City Regional Council for Higher Education. At the national level, the Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges (CASC) has produced successful results with larger groups of colleges and faculty. The strength of this approach is that much can be accomplished with participants for little money in concentrated periods of time that range from one day to one or more weeks. The weakness is that individuals and groups who receive training often find themselves isolated when they return to campus, either because their enthusiasm intimidates colleagues or because they are unable to share their experiences in a way that brings about change in others who have not had these experiences. More often the mission of a trained group fails simply because it was not part of a larger institutional development objective.

Everything considered, the slow but persistent process of home-growing our own experts in the field of faculty development seems to be a necessary prelude to the kind of results that are often promised in faculty development programs but seldom delivered.

Paradigm III: A Holistic Approach to Institutional Development--
The Integration of Faculty Development Methods and Practices (the future)

What, then, does this say about the future? Might we be moving toward a third paradigm in the field of faculty development? I believe we are. I see the possibility for a sophisticated paradigm that takes its direction primarily from our need to establish a holistic approach to total institutional development. This is why I would call our third paradigm

the integration of faculty development methods and practices,

While our theory continues to leap ahead of our practice, the basic notion is that we will learn how to link instructional, personal, and organizational development in ways that gradually increase a college's knowledge and skill in diagnosing, creating, and installing improvements on a community-wide basis. We will find ways of helping faculty and administrators learn what our college needs in the way of improvement, given our particular history and constituency, and our needs to improve performance in the service of students. In short, I am suggesting that the next quantum leap in the faculty improvement field will begin with what the college needs to perform its distinctive mission rather than with what the autonomous faculty member wants and needs. It will be about as different from the first paradigm as it can be.

Yet the very success of a holistic approach to institutional development will be found in the ability of a college community to establish working relationships between its mission and goals and the personal and instructional goals of its faculty. The process will be slow, time-consuming, and will need to involve faculty and administrators in new roles. I believe the methods, skills, and practices largely will be drawn from the field of organizational development and will center on such needs as planning, team-building, decision-making, problem-solving, conflict-management, and managerial development. The success of this approach also will be found in college-wide support of the personal development of faculty members. This support may take the form of in-depth and continuing discussions about teaching and the disciplines, career and life planning workshops, interpersonal skills training, personal growth seminars, and even therapeutic and supportive counseling.

Let me conclude by pointing very briefly to some of the things which suggest that we may be moving toward a third paradigm: Such a paradigm is timely because there is growing support for faculty development programming within many colleges and universities. It is not unusual to find boards of trustees now insisting that their college have a plan for the continuing growth and development of faculty, and that these plans be tied directly to the mission of their college and the overall plan that their college has for improving its performance. Second, we are seeing greater faculty interest and participation in institutional research and planning. This has tended to alter how faculty view the state of their college and has increased their ownership for securing its future. Third, as Al Smith points out in his paper for this conference, some colleges are creating a single system for faculty evaluation and development. The most experienced have found that when the two functions are separated--even to stress the importance of development, or to project it from the more unpleasant aspects of evaluation--neither worked very well in isolation from the other. Fifth, and closely tied to the fourth, the professional growth contract, initiated at Gordon College, has emerged as a truly significant innvoation. The increasing popularity of the professional growth contract, both the faculty and administrators, suggests that this may be an extremely important tool for bridging what the college needs in the way of improvement with how the individual faculty member and administrator wishes to grow personally and professionally in accomplishing shared institutional objectives. Finally, two new things appear to be happening in the area of instruction and issues that exist within the disciplines. The new priority seems to be over the meaning of each discipline, its nature and organizing principles, and its relation with other disciplines. Instructional develop-

ment programming for faculty is also moving toward realistic simulations in temporary educational settings that heighten personal awareness, test new instructional and organizational skills, and provide opportunities for innovative curriculum development to take place in relatively safe environments. The CASC experimental college at Bowdoin College, that I referred to earlier, is one example of this kind of programming.

While a number of the observations that I have just made are indicative that change may be taking place, and others point to some innovations which will enable effective change to take place, it will be several years before we know whether a new paradigm for the faculty development field has arrived. If we agree that a profound change has taken place in our thinking about faculty improvement over the past decade, however, it is unlikely that our current assumptions, methods, and practices will be sustained for long.

Chapter VII

Faculty Development and the Future

David O. Justice

The title of this conference embodies unusually well what I perceive as the future direction of change for faculty development. A major concern of all postsecondary institutions in the 1980's will be to do academic work well and, increasingly in the face of tight market demands, to do it better--more effectively and more efficiently.

Faculty Development is an intrinsic part of higher education in America. Not only do many colleges and universities provide periodic sabbaticals for faculty members to renew their research skills and extend their scholarly production, but the academic calendar and weekly schedules of faculty members reflect the assumption that intellectual renewal is part of the job.

For the most part, however, these provisions have been used for two principal activities, research or knowledge production and course development and revision. In recent years the development of the faculty member has been viewed in a more holistic manner. Both the needs of the individual for growth and development in roles beyond that of scholar, and the needs of the institution for more effective teaching, counseling, advising and management have suggested new uses for faculty development time and resources.

Several more or less abrupt changes converging in the late 60's contributed to a reassessment of the use of faculty development in

postsecondary education. Most importantly the rapid expansion of enrollments in the sixties brought both more students into colleges and universities and a greater diversity of students. Students who were underprepared by traditional standards, students who brought distinctive cultural and social orientations and ways of learning, students with special economic problems and students with particular goals for their education entered an expanded postsecondary education system in the decade of the 60's. In the 1970s as the enrollment swell crested, the number of adults as a portion of all learners continued to rise, creating additional pressures for change.

Adults are more likely to be learning part time. Their study is more likely to be interrupted for a variety of personal and career reasons. Adults also return to education for different reasons. They are more sure of their reasons for learning and, in general, their motivation to learn is greater. Finally the educational needs of adults are substantially different from 18 to 22 year olds. Both the course of study they wish to pursue and the way they learn differ significantly from the patterns established by students fresh out of high school, socialized into the dominate mode of information consumption through books, lectures and discussion sessions.

But the problems are not only for the adults. Women students, minority, ethnic and even traditional students have found problems with the educational experiences they confront. For them too the curriculum and the learning opportunities they are offered have not always met their educational needs or expectations. New concern among students for an education which equips them to cope effectively and meaningfully with

the various aspects of life, moves well beyond the cliched demand for relevance in courses.

People returning to education after several years in a career or with a grown family may have specific educational goals which go well beyond the offerings of most colleges and universities. Alternatively a generation growing to maturity in the sixties has different attitudes toward learning, different ways of understanding and different values about knowledge and abilities than earlier groups. Traditional conceptions of knowledge have lost much of their sanctity for people who have logged more time in front of a television than behind a book.

But the forces for change have come not only from the consumers of education. The proliferation of research and the legitimization of new and often surprising areas of inquiry has created what is often referred to as a "knowledge explosion." If the force of the blast has not toppled any major institutions yet, it has, at the very least created some highly visible cracks in the edifice of the academy.

No longer able to agree on what constitutes that body of knowledge which "every educated person" should possess, institutions have too often abdicated their responsibility to provide a coherent integrated learning experience for their students. Cooperation, coordination, integration of roles are too frequently viewed as encroachments on academic freedom. The teacher or scholar is expected to be sufficient unto her/himself.

Other factors exacerbate the problem. Institutions in which twenty, thirty or forty percent of the faculty once were tenured are now facing the prospect of a faculty in which seventy, eighty or ninety percent have tenure. The rate of change of faculty personnel has slowed

markedly. Mobility either vertical or horizontal has diminished. Many institutions are faced with the prospect of having essentially the same personnel in 1990 that they have today. Thus, normal practice of relying on natural growth and turnover of faculty to insure the infusion of new ideas and approaches appropriate to changed conditions no longer works. Changes, if they are to come, will have to emerge, for the most part, from the faculty already teaching.

Teachers in environmental studies programs will have to come from chemistry, biology and botany departments. Human Services faculty will have to be drawn from sociology, psychology, and social work departments. Teachers of adults will have to emerge from the classroom and enter the factory, the business office, the community center and the union hall. Writers of computer aided instruction or developers of individualized learning packets will have to step down from the lectern and learn about learning.

Society has also changed its expectations for education. Goals of equal educational opportunity for ethnic and racial minority groups as well as women must be met. Problems of structural unemployment are to be attacked through education. And individual satisfaction and personal development are viewed as the proper concerns of education. Finally in the second half of the decade of the 70's postsecondary education is being asked to instill a sense of values in students along with technical competence.

All of these problems have been attacked in one form or another through programs of faculty development. And, while faculty development programs in themselves cannot be expected wholly to solve this range of

problems, the movement does illustrate the extent to which change in the faculty is viewed as central to change in higher education.

Funding Faculty Development: The View From FIPSE

Each year since the creation of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, it has received hundreds of applications for faculty development programs. Many of these were enrichment programs providing a useful and desirable experience for faculty members, but lacking any promise of change after project funds were exhausted. Many proposals failed to articulate the problem toward which their faculty development project was aimed. Others described such a general malaise that it would be impossible to judge the impact of the project.

Many applicants requested support for further study for their faculty, a kind of supplemental to sabbaticals. Yet nowhere was the case made that a lack of subject matter knowledge was a pervasive problem in postsecondary education. Some applicants sought funds to renew "deadwood." But they then failed to articulate either a role for or description of such a person, once renewed.

A wide variety of strategies for faculty development projects were submitted. Perhaps most popular has been the establishment of a 'center,' which would be the focus for activities, resources, technical assistance, counseling and materials production in the service of faculty development. There are, of course, a number of such centers across the country and several have claims to real success. Nevertheless, we found that too often the idea for a center preceded a careful diagnosis of the problem at the particular campus. Smaller colleges, community colleges and even some medium sized universities probably could not adequately sustain a center and many not be well served by such a special designation.

A special word perhaps should be given to the question of released time. More than any other characteristic, released time (or as the more accountability sensitive would have it "assigned time") was a pervasive request in proposals for faculty development projects. Clearly there are activites which can only be accomplished when a faculty member is relieved from other duties to focus his or her efforts on a special project, but our experience with faculty development projects has strongly suggested that released time for faculty members to work more intensively on improving their effectiveness as teachers are not more successful than similar projects minus the provision of released time. In addition it is precisely this released time which is most difficult for the institution to sustain once outside funding has stopped. Thus the capacity of an institution to integrate into its budget a project which relies on extensive released time is significantly less than projects without heavy released time commitments.

Most faculty development proposals asked support to improve the quality and effectiveness of teaching. Some were more focused in their problem statements, identifying a particular clientele with a special need or concentrating on a better integration of learning activities and teaching programs. Among the most interesting were proposals which exposed faculty in a structured and systematic way to experiences outside of the academy. Internships in the community, exchanges with government and business, when part of a focused program can bring new insights about the purposes of education and new tools with which to effect them.

Some projects sought support for the redefinition of the roles of faculty and the restructuring of the incentive system. But only a few were either willing or able to make substantial claims to changing

the incentive and reward structures either within a single institution or across a sector of postsecondary education.

In 1974 the Fund initiated a Special Focus Program entitled, "New Incentive Structures: Encouraging More Effective Faculty Participation in the Teaching-Learning Process." Twelve awards were made in that competition. Several can claim some real success within the confines of what they proposed, yet from none of them was there to emerge a model for restructuring the dominate mode of allocating rewards, particularly criteria for decisions on promotion, tenure and retention. Nor has the Fund received any significant number of proposals which confront this problem directly.

Projects which were funded addressed most of the problem areas identified above. They differ in some important ways from the range of proposals received but reflect the diversity of issues which faculty development programs are deemed effective in addressing.

Improving Teaching Through Information and Training

The largest group of faculty development proposals received by the Fund sought to improve the quality of instruction. Teaching could be improved, they held, through some fairly direct efforts. Teaching was to be improved by providing information about new approaches and technologies; through intensive training workshops or seminars; through released time for research on teaching; and through the provision of technical assistance to faculty members confronting particular problems.

The inspiration for many of these projects was the development of a new learning approach. Alternatively the belief that the knowledge of what works in teaching is well ahead of the practice was a frequent

beginning for such projects. And, in some cases, the need to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of teaching within the institution was at the root of the proposal.

At Bowling Green State University in Ohio, the graduate school initiated a program of training for its graduate assistants, who were preparing for a career in teaching at the postsecondary level. An intensive week of workshops and seminars demonstrating new approaches and practices in teaching was followed throughout the first semester with supporting programs at the departmental level. These sought to orient students to teaching within the discipline. After three years of declining support from the Fund the program costs were absorbed by the Graduate School. The project was to have three effects. First the project would improve the quality of teaching for a considerable portion of undergraduates at Bowling Green who were enrolled in courses taught directly by graduate students. Second it was anticipated that by increasing the teaching literacy and repertoire of graduate assistants they would be more competent professionals when they assumed faculty positions. Third it was hoped that the whole enterprise would have a "trickle-up" effect by interesting regular faculty and challenging those using graduate assistants in their courses. An evaluation of the project in its third year indicated some real success in attaining the first objective. Students and Graduate Assistants indicated improved performance. Two few Graduate Students had assumed professional roles to judge the second goals' success. The number of faculty influenced by the program seems to have been limited to those most intimately involved from the first. The program has been a source of informed adult to other institutions seeking to initiate similar programs.

At the University of Maine and at Utah State University programs were established to provide a variety of technical assistance and instructional design support to faculty. And at the University of Michigan, Robert Kozma examined the differential effects of a variety of interventions with faculty members, designed to improve the quality of their teaching. He also studied the extent to which their experiences influenced wider circles of faculty. The results of this project are reported in the Journal of Higher Education, September/October, 1978. His conclusions, which appear to be consistent with the experiences in Maine and Utah, suggest that individual faculty teaching practices can be changed through a variety of interventions, but widespread adoption of new approaches to teaching are much more difficult to achieve. Training in new approaches to teaching, discussions of problems of teaching and provision of special resources for teaching can all be helpful, but rarely when used alone result in significant widespread change in the dominate mode of teaching and learning. Resources, technical assistance and training, then, appear to be the necessary but not sufficient conditions for effecting change through faculty development programs.

Changing Incentive and Reward Structures

A second group of projects proceeded along a different set of assumptions about how to improve teaching. These projects argue that the incentive and reward system presently operating on most campuses fails to reward good teaching and thereby frustrates the motivations of faculty members to attend to improving teaching. Within this group of projects, a further assumption of a number of projects holds that the failure of the system to reward excellent teaching has been due to

the lack of adequate measures of teaching competence. Thus a number of major efforts have been undertaken to develop useful approaches to course and teaching evaluation.

The Purdue "Cafeteria" system, and the Kansas State 'IDEA' system, both represented in the Fund's National Project III, have made significant advances in the validity and applicability of student evaluation of courses and teaching. And the Southern Regional Education Board is providing technical assistance to thirty institutions in the Southeast to develop reliable wholistic systems of faculty evaluation, which go beyond student ratings.

Behind these projects is the assumption, sometimes explicit, sometimes implicit, that an enhanced evaluation system will result in more attention being paid to the contributions of faculty as teachers. Some of the research at Kansas State for example have shown significant improvement in teaching following initial use of the IDEA instrument, when it was associated with consultation with the faculty member about ways to improve her/his ratings.

Anecdotal evidence from Deans and Departmental chairs does seem to suggest that the availability of better information about teaching practices and quality which comes from evaluations, has resulted in its wider use as a criteria in directions to hire, promote and tenure faculty members. Or, as one Dean put it, reflecting the 'buyers market' in academe, "I am no longer restricted to demanding excellence in scholarship among new recruits, I can now also demand an outstanding record of teaching."

Another group of projects concerned about the incentive and reward system took a different approach.

The Teaching Research Division of the Oregon State System of Higher Education set out to find out more precisely first what is rewarded in the existing system of incentives and rewards. Through a series of interviews and questionnaires given to faculty and administrators within the Oregon State System they assessed both the preceived and preferred criteria for making decisions about hiring, promotion and tenure. As one might expect their findings were considerably more complex than the research-teaching dichotomy suggests. There were important differences among institutions of different size and mission. Politics and longevity also seemed to figure more prominently into decisions than many would like to admit. There was, however, a consistent and significant preference among faculty that teaching be more highly valued and used than is presently the case.

At the University of Wisconsin at Oshkosh the change in reward structures was made more explicit. University resources, supplemented by outside soruces provided a series of renewal activities for faculty members interested in and committed to improving teaching in a variety of new settings.

A more general approach to changing the incentive system in post-secondary education was taken by the American Sociological Association. In their projec ton Teaching Undergraduate Sociology, a major effort was made to integrate more thoroughly into the profession of Sociology the role of teaching. A discussion with the Project Director, Dr. Hans Mauksch, is reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education for October 16, 1978. There he elaborates the theory of change through the development of a movement within the association. The project created a network of teaching activists within the Association and from there the establishment of the Association's newly created Center on Undergraduate Teaching.

While it it difficult to ascribe precise and specific changes in teaching to this project, it has clearly affected the attitude with which teaching is considered in academic sociology. A project to increase teaching competence among Political Scientists was undertaken by the American Political Science Association and a curriculum development project with the Modern Language Association are having a similar effect in these associations.

Faculty development projects have had even more ambitious purposes, of course. Several faculty development projects were used to reorient the faculty and the institution to the needs of a new clientele.

Serving Special Clientele

El Paso Community College in Texas used a three-year faculty development grant to assist in the establishment of a comprehensive bilingual bi-cultural institution. Language training, curriculum development grants and cross-cultural experiences were all used to develop this unique institutional mission.

An "Open Enrollment College Teaching Program" at Boston University trained graduate students to teach in settings where students come from diverse backgrounds with different abilities and different learning needs. Apprenticed to senior faculty members, graduate students worked to design and eventually teach courses in the evening school and at local community colleges.

The East Central Consortium in Ohio is working with faculty who are teaching adults in an external degree program sponsored by the consortium. Faculty learn to access learners' needs, understand adults' motivations and styles of learning.

In these projects special knowledge about the intended clientele served to give the faculty development project focus and scope. The results of these projects are mixed. While all have had immediate or short term success in improving faculty skills and understanding, the long term success of the project has in two instances been thwarted by organizational impedments to the full implementation of a program that would adequately serve the special clientele.

Institutional Renewal

A number of projects saw faculty development as the motor for revitalizing or renewing the whole institution or changing its mission.

Greenville Technical Education Center in South Carolina used a faculty devleopment grant to assist in its transition from a two year technical institute to a comprehensive Community College. Ottawa University in Kansas revised its curriculum, and its mode of teaching through a faculty development grant. Faculty members became "managers of learning." Discipline defined departments were superceded by interdisciplinary issue-oriented centers. Faculty development contracts were used to encourage faculty to participate in the mission change of the institution.

The Social Sciences Division of Pacific Lutheran University is tying its program more explicitly to the skills and knowledge necessary for its graduates to be effective, productive citizens. Faculty are involved in commodity development projects with students, in the management of student internships in the community and in the revision and modification of curriculum to fit better the new objectives for student learning.

Alverno College in Milwaukee changed the entire basis for its educational system by focusing on the results or outcomes of the college experience. As a result faculty development became the central effort of four years of Fund support. Faculty members who had been dispensers of knowledge became assessors of learning and facilitaters of learning. Training, research, curriculum development and redevelopment were required as the learning results began to define the learning experience.

Macalester College in St. Paul, Minnesota, had a grant which allowed partial released time for faculty to spend time in the non-academic world as interns in businesses, public institutions and government. Combined with a program of mutual classroom visitation and a seminar on teaching and learning problems, the project stimulated an on-going commitment by the faculty to reassess their teaching responsibilities in view of the educational needs of students preparing for a world of work.

All of these projects can claim some real success. Ottawa University has discovered a new mission in the role of its faculty as counselors and advisors to a new clientele of students both on and off campus. Alverno has developed as the most advanced example of a competency curriculum at the college level and Macalester College still draws upon the inspiration of its faculty intern experience to initiate new programs.

The successes and limitation of these projects, however, depend, in part, on a number of other conditions. Institutional commitment to a particular direction or process for change was central to all but Macalester. Usually a senior level administrator presented a new vision for the institution. Importantly, however, faculty "ownership" of the project became an early and critical element in these projects. Disagreement over faculty participation was perhaps the single most difficult

obstacle in the Alverno project. And at Macalester the total faculty ownership of the project was the singular aspect which was generally agreed to have contributed to its overall success.

An evaluation of several "Institutional Renewal" projects supported by the Fund was carried out by the Society for Values in Higher Education in 1976. The results of their interviews are presented in a report, "Renewing Liberal Arts Colleges" by Harry E. Smith. The evaluation pointed to several factors influencing effective renewal as well as critical elements necessary for success. In several respects, their findings paralleled those we have discussed in this group of faculty development projects.

The results of that evaluation were influential in the project on Institutional Renewal through Faculty Development by the Society for Values in Higher Education under the direction of Jerry Gaff. It has been perhaps the most ambitious faculty development project supported to date by the Fund. Sixteen institutions in the southeast and midwest representing colleges and universities, public and private, participated. The project director with an office in Washington, D.C. and aided by an active advisory board, drawn largely from the Society, managed the process of institutional selection, and the establishment of significant faculty development programs in each institution.

In addition to being the largest, it has also been the best documented. Reports, interviews, site visits and a final reporting conference provide the most extensive set of data the Fund has received on such a project.

The conclusions which can be fairly drawn from these data are heartening indeed. The overwhelming conclusion of participants and

observers alike has been that the project has positively affected both the individuals who participated and the institutions from which they were drawn. Individuals report an increased awareness of the importance and complexity of teaching; an understanding of new approaches to teaching and an increased commitment to student learning. Institutions seem to exhibit a heightened appreciation of the teaching role, increased commitment of support for teaching excellence and a willingness to extend and enhance faculty development efforts.

It is perhaps important to remember that the project is finished less than a year and the extent to which these effects will outline the project are unclear. It is premature to pronounce any of the institutions "renewed" as a result of the project. But any fair measure of the extent of institutional commitments to faculty development during a period of widespread retrenchment would have to conclude that the institutions now "own" these projects and with them, they have internalized some new attitudes about the importance of teaching and learning as the core of the institution and a new respect for the professional who teaches with excellence.

Elevating the Importance of Teaching

As another level, the Fund has supported efforts to change the values of teaching in the minds of faculty and administrators. Too often teaching has been regarded as the residual activity which any faculty member, even graduate students, can do, even if they are not scholars. The constellation of circumstances which created such an environment is complex and not least inspired by massive Federal funding of research in a variety of fields. But it has also been nourished by a misplaced sense

of professionalism in disciplinary associations who view their members as historians, sociologists or chemists first and teachers only secondarily.

Institutions too have frequently reinforced the impression that teaching is lightly valued by allocating the rewards of the institution to those who do least teaching.

In 1975, the Fund initiated a National Project under the title, "Elevating the Importance of Teaching." Its purpose was to solicit proposals from and make awards to those institutions which had some evidence of having effected the overall esteem with which teaching was held by the faculty and the institution. Awards were made to twelve institutions, as well as one state system. The variety of project activities represented among the associate institutions included student rating of faculty teaching systems, program evaluation systems, incentive grant award programs, awards for outstanding teaching, a faculty consultation model and various combinations of these. Over the two year project, Associates evaluated their own activities, collaborated with other Associates on ways to improving their programs, and prepared and published a series of papers under the title Criteria, which addressed in a clear and systematic manner the most recent thinking on the uses and applications of the programs represented in the Project.

While there has been no evaluation of the project as a whole, reports from the individual institutions have agreed on several points. Institutional collaboration afforded individuals an opportunity to see their project from another perspective, to borrow ideas and refinements from similar projects, and to call upon outside expertise in presenting and explaining their project to authorities within their institution. Mutual evaluation of projects increased the confidence project direction had in

the validity of their findings. Working together on the development of Criteria forced each participant to see his project in the larger content of the general problems and needs facing postsecondary education.

A project undertaken by Change Magazine had as its goal a similar effect. By selecting and highlighting in a number of special reports, examples of outstanding teaching within the major disciplinary groups, it was hoped that the attention of the associations and of disciplinary based faculty would be brought to focus on the elements of good teaching. Six Reports were published; five focusing on teaching examples within the major disciplines and the sixth looking at interdisciplinary teaching innovations. A final report also contained an evaluation of the project and the success of its approach. The general conclusion was that the Associations were not affected as much as might have been hoped. But other important outcomes did appear. Teachers whose projects were highlighted found themselves with a greater degree of local fame and appreciation. Other faculty members both locally and from across the country began to ask them about their teaching. And in several institutions the reports, taken as a group, served as the focal point for a series of seminars on what constitutes effective teaching. The most lasting impact of the project may be the resource provided by a compilation of the various examples of good teaching grouped by teaching approach or method and introduced by a discussion of the approach used. This compilation, entitled Guide to Effective Teaching, is available from Change Magazine Press. At the least the project demonstrated the vitality and variety of teaching improvement activities on-going in postsecondary education. It provided concrete examples for people to examine, consider and adopt.

Management and Organization

Much of what has been developed under the heading of faculty development in the past decade has focused either on a refining of skills and techniques about teaching or a raising of consciousness about the importance and centrality of teaching within the changed context of a mass and increasingly adult postsecondary system. Early programs of information and training has shown up the centrality of supporting structures to enhance the quality of programs to improve teaching.

Changing patterns of employment within higher education, decreased mobility, increased demands for representation of groups heretofore underrepresented in the academic leadership, all point to a new objective for faculty development projects. First, if faculty members no longer view their career path in terms of moving from institution to institution until they reach full professor, how can faculty development programs bring about better understanding of the mutual responsibilities between the faculty member and the institution? What role does faculty development have to redefine roles and expectations which allow for greater flexibility for the faculty member and increased capacity of the institution to adjust to shifting student and social needs?

The State University of New York has initiated a program of faculty retraining in which faculty are provided a summer and a semester off to study intensively in an allied discipline. Individuals are selected with a view of finding people with which to prepare for a high enrollment discipline. The project which faced initial resistance from individuals and from departments is now in high demand.

The Pennsylvania State Colleges Educational Trust Fund, a joint faculty union-administration organization devoted to faculty development

has begun a program to counsel faculty members into new career paths in business and government. Aimed particularly at areas of low enrollment in which the possibility of retrenchment in the next five years is high, this program is intended to provide a new set of options for both the individual faculty member, and the Pennsylvania State Colleges system.

The College of Liberal Arts at Oregon State University has just begun a program which seeks to integrate the faculty member more fully into the mission of the college, providing him both with an increased understanding of the constraints under which the college must work, and the knowledge and experience to effect change. Faculty are provided limited released time from teaching to spend a semester in an internship within the offices of two deans. The faculty member then returns to his faculty responsibilities after the internship with only the responsibility to be useful to his colleagues in translating ideas for improving teaching into reality.

Conclusions

If the various purposes toward which faculty development efforts have been turned are clear, the relative success of the techniques and strategies are more difficult to chart.

Evaluation of effective teaching; training in new pedagogical techniques or more generic interpersonal skills or in self-awareness or empathy are frequently used practices in faculty development. More common is the traditional passive approach to faculty development of offering faculty members the resources of audio-visual materials and equipment; books; curricula materials and perhaps consulting services of an instructional designer or an expert in some particular pedagogy.

Less widespread, but with a promising record at a few institutions are faculty growth contracts and peer counseling programs.

The difficulty in making general statements about what faculty development approach works where is that the diversity of models multiplied by the variety of institutional types using them by the various purposes they are in tended to serve, leaves too few examples in the resulting cells of this three-dimensional matirx. Nevertheless some generalizations seem to be in order.

- The Faculty sense of ownership of the development activities is essential. At its best faculty development programs result in an enhanced sense of what is possible for the faculty member.
- Faculty Development efforts need a substance and direction if the change initiated is to result in a lasting improvement as distinct from a temporary willingness to change.
- Beyond Faculty development must be an institutional capacity to respond to and support the changes initiated through faculty development programs.
- Consortial arrangements are particularly fruitful means for initiating faculty development activities on a number of campuses, but is usually insufficient to assure long term implementation at campus level.

The future of Faculty Development, I believe lies in its capacity to assure quality, efficiency and effectiveness. Increasingly faculty development programs will be called on to link the personal and professional objectives of the individual faculty member to the mission and functions of the institution in the service of effective, meaningful learning.

Chapter VIII

Concluding Remarks

James L. Bess

This brief chapter (written retrospectively--some months after the presentation of the papers at the conference) is both a lament and an explanation. As one reads through the papers in the book, one is impressed by the richness and variety of the subject. Faculty development, still in its infancy, as Gary Quehl points out, has yet to circumscribe its spheres of activity. With so many different approaches at so many institutions by so many innovators, those of us wishing to describe its domains in parsimonious fashion are bound by our own visions, conceptions and experience to omit some areas thought by others to be critical to understanding the field. It must be remembered, of course, that this book is, after all, a report of the proceedings at a conference the intent of which was to be useful, especially to those with little exposure to the field. Indeed, the pre-conference propaedeutic invitation to the paper presenters was intentionally broad. The result is as might be expected. The authors of each chapter have provided insights from a variety of perspectives, ranging from philosophical and conceptual speculations to practical, no-nonsense experience-based descriptions. We are pleased with the results but recognize that there is still much to be said.

For example, we have not incorporated sufficiently in the book descriptions of the work of Kenneth Eble or Jerry Gaff, whose contributions to this field are considerable. Nor are there sufficient discussions of the AAUP Project to Improve College Teaching, the rather

different approaches to faculty development for non-traditional institutions, the new research on cognitive learning styles (particularly the work of Jonathan Warren), the new theories of adult learning and development, and the results of the pioneering work in this area of funding agencies other than FIPSE, such as Kellogg, Mellon and Lilly. Also missing is a consideration of the important efforts now being undertaken at the statewide level, especially in Florida and New York. Doubtless, there are others.*

Nevertheless, the proceedings are, we hope, of more than passing value. If we must lament the impossibility of including more, we look with satisfaction at the product as it now stands--studded with information and insights about faculty development--its past, present and future--and containing a goodly measure of comprehensiveness and coherence.

*We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer of the manuscript for pointing out some of these omissions.

References

Baldridge, J. Victor. Power and Conflict in the University. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1971.

Bergquist, William H. and Stephen R. Phillips. A Handbook for Faculty Development, Vols. I & II, Washington, D.C., Council for the Advancement of Small College, 1975, 1977.

Bess, James L. "The Academic Profession in Transition," Higher Education Review, Fall, 1977, Vol. 1, No. 1.

Bess, James L. "Anticipatory Socialization of Graduate Students," Research in Higher Education, Vol. 8, No. 4, 1978.

Bess, James L. "Integrating Student and Faculty Life Cycles," Review of Educational Research, Fall, 1973, Vol. 43, No. 4.

Bess, James L. "The Motivation to Teach," Journal of Higher Education, May/June, 1977, Vol. 48, No. 1.

Bess, James L. "New Life for Faculty and Their Institutions," Journal of Higher Education, May/June, 1975, Vol. 46, No. 3.

Bolton, C.K. and Boyer, R.K. "Organizational Development for Academic Departments," Journal of Higher Education, May, 1973, Vol. 44, No. 5.

Boyd, James E. and Schietinger, E.F. Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Southern Colleges and Universities. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.

Boyer, Ronald K. and Grasha, Anthony F. "Theoretical Issues and Practical Strategies for Administrative Development." Faculty Resource Center, University of Cincinnati, October, 1977.

Centra, John. Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1976.

Centra, John. How Universities Evaluate Faculty Performance: A Survey of Department Heads. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Chickering, Arthur, et al. Developing the College Curriculum: A Handbook for Faculty and Administrators, Washington, D.C., Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, 1977.

Chickering, A.W. Education and Identity. San Francisco: Joseey-Bass, 1969.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "20-Year Trends in Higher Education." Fact File, Volume XV, Number 3, September 19, 1977, p. 8.

References (continued)

Cohen, M.D. and March, J.G. Leadership and Ambiguity. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Crockett, C. "The Higher Education Institute: A Vehicle for Change." Journal of Higher Education, May, 1973, Vol. 44, No. 5.

Gaff, Jerry. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.

Gaff, Jerry. PIRIT Newsletter, No. 4, October, 1977.

Goldmark, Josephine C. Nursing and Nursing Education in the United States, np., Committee for the Study of Nursing Education, 1923.

Grasha, Anthony F. Assessing and Developing Faculty Performance: Principles and Models. Cincinnati, Ohio: Communication and Education Associates, 1977.

Harvey, O.J., Hunt, D.E., and Schroder, H.M. Conceptual Systems and Personality Organization. New York: Wiley, 1961.

Heath, D.H. Explorations of Maturity. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Heth, D.H. Growing Up in College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Hildebrand, M. and Wilson, R.C. Effective University Teaching and Its Evaluation. Berkeley: Center for Research in Higher Education, 1970.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolution (2nd Edition). Chicago and London: University of Chicago, 1970.

Kulik, J.A. "Evaluation of Teaching." Memo to the Faculty No. 54. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, The University of Michigan, February, 1974.

Lysaught, Jerome P. An Abstract for Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.

Magarell, Jack. "Part-Time Professors on the Increase." The Chronicle of Higher Education, Volume XV, No. 18, January 16, 1978, p. 1, 6.

Mathis, Claude B. "Faculty Development--New Meanings for Old Needs," in L.P. Grayson & J.M. Biedenbach (eds.), Proceedings, Sixth Annual Frontiers in Education Conference. The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc., 1976.

Miles, M.B. "Temporary Systems." Innovation in Education. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964, Chapter 19.

Miller, Richard I. Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publisher, 1974.

References (continued)

Morstain, Barry R. and Gaff, Jerry. "Student Attitudes Toward Teaching Improvement," Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education Newspaper. Vol. 3, Issue 3, Fall, 1977.

Parker, C.A. Encouraging Development in College Students. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1978.

Perry, W. Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.

Peterson, Marvin W. "The Organization of Departments." Research Report No. 2, American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., December 1, 1970.

Rank, O. Will Therapy; and Truth and Reality. New York: Knopf, 1945.

Seldin, Peter. How College Evaluate Professors. New York: Blythe-Pennington, Ltd., 1975.

Sanford, N. Where Colleges Fail. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1967.

Scriven, Michael. "The Methodology of Evaluation," in Carol Weiss, Editor, Evaluating Action Programs: Readings in Social Actions and Education. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1972, pp. 123-136.

Smith, Albert B. Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education. ERIC/Higher Education Research Report, No. 8, 1976.

Thompson, James D. Organizations in Action. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.

Watson, G. "What psychology can we feel sure about?" Teachers College Record, 1960, 61, No. 5., p. 253-257.

Author and Workshop Leader Biographies

JAMES L. BESS...Associate Professor of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Bess' articles have been widely used as guides to faculty development. His book, University Matrix, will be published in 1980.

RONALD K. BOYER...Associate Director, Faculty Resource Center, University of Cincinnati. The editor of "Organizational Development in Higher Education," Dr. Boyer is widely regarded for his scholarship in this field as well as his creative solutions to practical problems of institutional change.

LANCE C. BUHL...President, Projects for Educational Development. Formerly a consultant for the Cleveland Commission on Higher Education, Dr. Buhl is the author of "Contracting for Professional Development in Academe."

JOHN A. CENTRA...Senior Research Psychologist, Educational Testing Service. Author of "Strategies for Improving College Teaching" and "Faculty Development Practices in U.S. Colleges and Universities."

JONATHAN D. FIFE...Director, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. Besides being at the hub of a vast information gathering and disseminating network, Dr. Fife's credentials include the publication of "Applying the Goals of Student Financial Aid."

DAVID O. JUSTICE...Program Officer, Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education. Mr. Justice has been actively involved in a large number of faculty development programs through sponsorship of the fund.

RICHARD I. MILLER...Vice-President for Educational Services, SUNY at Brockport. Dr. Miller's two books, Evaluating Faculty Performance and Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation have provided invaluable service to colleges and universities around the country.

ROGER MYERS...Professor of Psychology and Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. Long an acute observer of faculty-student dynamics, Professor Myers is the author of such works as "Faculty Perceptions of Student Success" and "Career Development in the College Years."

GARY H. QUEHL...President, The Council for the Advancement of Small College. Dr. Quehl has long been a leader in the development of comprehensive programs for instructional and organizational development in the nation's smaller institutions.

PETER SELDIN...Associate Professor, Fordham University. Dr. Seldin's two books, How Colleges Evaluate Professors and Teaching Professors to Teach have established him as an international authority on this subject.

AL SMITH...Associate Research Scientist, Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, University of Michigan and Associate Professor of Higher Education, University of Florida. Among the nation's foremost experts in this area, Dr. Smith founded and edits the Faculty Development and Evaluation Newspaper.

WILLIAM TOOMBS...Professor of Higher Education, The Pennsylvania State University. Dr. Toombs has written extensively on faculty development, including "A Three-Dimensional View of Faculty Development."

INDEX

A

Academic profession	5
Adult growth and development	5, 12, 99, 122, 133
Advising	72, 134
Authority	71

C

Causes (of faculty development movement)	22, 111
Challenge	99
Change agent	85, 91, 93
Climate	9
Clinical experience	6
Colleague ratings	34
Consortia	142
Consultation	115
Crisis	90
Short-term	91
Long-term	93
Contracts	47, 118
Curriculum	113

D

Development	17, 29, 98
Dualistic thinking	101

E

Effectiveness	40, 76
Environments	9, 94
Evaluation	5, 11, 17, 31, 58, 130

F

Faculty	13
Faculty development	17
Types	29
Funding	46, 56, 69, 82

G

Graduate students	128

H

History of faculty development 19, 121

I

Implementation 43
Information 70
Innovation 67, 107
Institute for Research and Training in Higher Education 67
Internships
Intervention 85

J

Justification 75

K

Knowledge utilization 6, 114, 123

L

Learning 7, 97

M

Management 65, 81, 139
Models 64, 115

N

Name of unit 79
Needs (of faculty) 53, 60

O

Organizations 7, 50, 65
Organizational development 64, 116, 133
Organizational unit, location 69, 71, 125
Ownership 141

P

Paradigms	108
Personal growth and development	64C
Personnel change	79
Personnel/staff	82
Pilot testing	88
Planning	84
Politics	65, 69, 73
Professionals, professionalization	1
Programs	
Needs for faculty development programs	35
Evaluation	58
Types	64, 125
Management	65
Development	84
Publications	137

R

Relativistic thinking	101
Released time	126, 134
Resource materials	88
Rewards	6, 129

S

Satisfactions (of faculty)	13, 56
Service motif	10, 38
Specialization	8
Sponsors	74
Strategies for development	87, 114
Students	99
Ratings of faculty	33

T

Task forces	92
Teaching	64B, 127, 129, 136
Tenure	123
Training	6, 89, 127

U

Use	54, 68

W

Workshops	89, 113, 119, 127